FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-227
Tuesday
28 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-227 CONTENTS *28 November 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Western Distrust of Disarmament Efforts Noted *[Oganov in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 18 Nov]* 1
Commentary on Possible U.S. Troop Cuts *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 1
Belousov Discusses Ending Nuclear Tests *[TASS]* 2
5-Year-Old Film Shown on Dismantling of Missiles *[Moscow TV]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskikh Conducts 27 Nov News Briefing 4
  No Arms to El Salvador *[TASS]* 4
  Shelling of Kabul *[TASS]* 4
  Gorbachev-Mitterrand Meeting *[TASS]* 4
  Mazowiecki Visit *[Warsaw PAP]* 4
TASS Roundup 5
Gremitskikh Interviewed on CPCZ Changes *[Prague Radio]* 5
Gremitskikh on CSSR Situation, 1968 Events *[Bratislava Radio]* 6
Italian-Soviet Magazine DIALOGUE Launched *[TASS]* 6
Conference of Socialist, Other News Agencies Held *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush, Thatcher Discuss Upcoming Malta Meeting *[TASS]* 7
Bessmertynkh, Matlock Discuss Ties, Meeting *[TASS]* 7
Cheney's Concept of U.S. Armed Forces Examined *[Bogachev on TASS]* 7
Cheney To Attend NATO Meetings 28-29 Nov *[TASS]* 8
Soviet-U.S. Military Group's Talks Reported *[TASS]* 8
U.S. Conservatives Urge Hard Line on USSR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Nov]* 8
Israeli-U.S. Strategic Cooperation Viewed *[Prokofyev Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 10
Bush Condemns Murder of Lebanese President *[TASS]* 11
Bush Signs Budget Bills; Allocations Detailed *[TASS]* 11
Budget Prompts U.S. To Curb Soviet Immigrants *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Nov]* 11
Soviet-U.S. Trade Commission Concludes Session *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 12
TASS Reports U.S. Interest in Trade Ties 12
Need Seen for Impetus to U.S.-Soviet Trade *[Orlov on TASS]* 13
Petrovskiy Receives Carnegie Council Chairman *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 13
Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement To Visit U.S. *[TASS]* 13
Parliamentarians to U.S. for Human Rights Seminar *[TASS]* 14
Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney's USSR Visit 14
  Arrival in Kiev 22 Nov *[TASS]* 14
  IZVESTIYA Interview With Mulroney *[19 Nov]* 14
  Dinner Speech at Kremlin *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 16
  Meeting With Ukrainian Leaders *[TASS]* 18
  Possibilities for Trade Assessed *[TASS]* 19
  USSR-Canadian Business Roundtable *[TASS]* 19
  Polar Research Cooperation Prospects *[TASS]* 20

China

Heilongjiang Delegation Visits USSR 20
  Arrival in Moscow 23 Nov *[Moscow International]* 20
  Visits Leningrad *[Moscow International]* 21

- Border Disarmament Discussion Ends *[Beijing XINHUA]* 21
  - Officer Interviewed on Border Situation *[Moscow International]* 22
- USSR-PRC Ties Since May Summit Reviewed *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 22

Northeast Asia

- Reportage on Yakovlev's Visit to Japan 23
  - Interviewed by NOVOYE VREMYA *[Moscow International]* 23
  - Interviewed by Moscow Radio *[Moscow International]* 24
  - Visit, Japan Ties Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 25
  - 'New Relations' With Japan Urged *[Ivanov on Moscow International]* 26
- Japan's Kaifu Favors Friendly Relations *[TASS]* 26
- Shevardnadze Cited on Relations With ROK *[Moscow International]* 26
- ROK Sovereignty, UN Membership Discussed *[Moscow International]* 27
- ROK Purchase of New U.S. Fighters Criticized *[Moscow International]* 27
- CPSU Delegation Studies DPRK Party Cadre Work *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 28
- USSR-DPRK Journalists Conference Noted *[Moscow International]* 28

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Vietnamese Delegation Pays Official Visit 19 Nov 28
  - Arrival in Moscow 19 Nov *[TASS]* 28
  - Studies Soviet Experience *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 29
  - Nguyen Thi Binh on Perestroyka *[Moscow International]* 29
  - Trade, Payments Protocol Signed *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 29
- Gen Kochetov To Pay Visit to Vietnam, Laos *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Nov]* 29
- SRV Spokesman Deplores UN Cambodian Resolution *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 29

Near East & South Asia

- Afghan Opposition Releases Two Soviet POW's *[TASS]* 30
  - Further on Release *[TASS]* 30
- U.S. Role in Afghanistan Analyzed *[Biryukov on TASS]* 30
- Najibullah on Peace Talks, Relations *[Moscow TV]* 31
- Rebel Hits on Kabul Military Targets Denied *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 33
- Congratulations Sent to New Lebanese Premier 33
  - Supreme Soviet Presidium *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 33
  - Council of Ministers Message *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 33
- Navy Chief Chernavin Visits Algeria *[TASS]* 33
- Minister Ends Kuwait Visit, Leaves for Iraq *[TASS]* 33

East Europe

- Polish Premier Mazowiecki Ends Visit, Talks 34
  - 23 Nov Welcoming Party Listed *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 34
  - Meets With Ryzhkov 25 Nov *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 34
  - Aboimov Addresses Soviet Poles *[Warsaw PAP]* 34
  - Visits Smolensk; Leaves for Leningrad *[IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* 34
  - Visits Leningrad 27 Nov *[TASS]* 35
  - Departs Leningrad for Warsaw *[TASS]* 36
- Mazowiecki Speaks for 'Majority' of Poles *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 36
- CPSU-PZPR Seminar Held in Kursk 22 Nov *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 38
- Lukyanov Accepts Polish Envoy's Credentials *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 39
- CSSR Unrest, Political Developments Reported 40
  - News Conference on Leadership Changes *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 40
  - 26 Nov Meetings With Opposition *[TASS]* 41
  - Premier Resigns Over Slow Pace of Reform *[IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]* 41
  - Developments at CPCZ Plenum Noted *[IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* 42
  - Complex Situation, CPCZ Disunity Noted *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 43
  - CPCZ 'Losing Popularity' Daily *[Moscow TV]* 44
  - General Strike, CPCZ 'Crisis' Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Nov]* 44

Deputies Want 1968 Invasion of CSSR Condemned *[AFP]* 45
GDR Moves Against Speculation Reported *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 45
  Further on Antispeculation Measures *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 45
E. Berlin Police Prevent 'Chaos' at Wall *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Nov]* 46
GDR Premier Thanks USSR Council of Ministers *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 47
Preliminary Results of Hungarian Referendum *[TASS]* 47
Hungary's MSZP Facing Growing Opposition *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Nov]* 48
Hungary-USSR Trade Imbalance Viewed *[TRUD 28 Oct]* 49
RCP Congress Ends; Nicu Ceausescu Cited *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 51
Vorotnikov Visits Romanian Farm Equipment Exhibit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 51
Yugoslav Communists' Need for Unity Noted *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 52
Ryzhkov Condolences Over SFRY Mining Disaster *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Aboimov Receives Bulgarian Envoy 23 Nov *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 53

West Europe

East Bloc Changes Impact on Malta Meeting Viewed *[Kondrashov in IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* 53
Shevardnadze Interviewed by L'UNITA Director *[TASS]* 55
Adamishin on Aims of Gorbachev's Italy Visit *[LA REPUBBLICA 24 Nov]* 55
Akhromeyev Discusses East Bloc Military Alliance *[ANSA]* 56
Gorbachev Adviser Cited on Rome, Malta Meetings *[ANSA]* 57
Italian Foreign Minister Views Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* 57
Italians Eager for Upcoming Gorbachev Visit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Nov]* 58
USSR, Italy Sign Commercial Cooperation Accord *[TASS]* 59
CPSU Vatican Expert Kovalskiy Interviewed *[LA REPUBBLICA 25 Nov]* 59
PCI Contemplates New Left-Wing Organization *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 60
Yazov 'Angry' About Questions on Czechoslovakia *[Hamburg Die Welt 27 Nov]* 61
  Yazov on Soviet Troops in CSSR *[Vienna TV]* 61
Shevardnadze Receives Spanish Envoy J.A. Yanes *[TASS]* 62
Ryutel Denies Writing Article in Swedish Paper *[TASS]* 62
Sweden's Andersson on Cooperation with Estonia
  [Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 10 Nov] 62
  In Riga for Cooperation Talks *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 10 Nov]* 63
CPSU Delegation Returns From Visit to France *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 63
Lukyanov Talks With French, FRG Visitors Noted *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 63
Silayev-Led Delegation Pays Visit to FRG *[TASS]* 63
Yakovlev Receives FRG's Bahr for Discussion *[TASS]* 64
Vlasov Receives FRG's Rau, Discusses Relations *[TASS]* 64
  Joint Statement Signed *[TASS]* 64
FRG's Kohl Cited on East-West Relations *[19 Nov]* 64
East Berliners Desire for Unification Denied *[IZVESTIYA 19 Nov]* 65
West Berlin SEW Board Resigns, Events Weighed *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 65
FRG Admiral Interviewed on East-West Ties *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Nov]* 65
FRG Admiral Indignant Over Ban on Visit *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 67

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Culture Minister Speaks to Supreme Soviet 21 Nov *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 23 Nov]* 68
Article Discusses Supreme Soviet Press Bill *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Nov]* 70
Moscow TV Relays 27 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings 71
  1600 GMT 71
  1646 GMT 72
  1757 GMT 73
  1906 GMT 74
  2008 GMT 74
  2044 GMT 75
  2142 GMT 76
Supreme Soviet Approves Draft Land Law *[TASS]* 76
Supreme Soviet Holds Joint Session 28 Nov 77

Session Previewed *[TASS]* 77
Servicemen's Amnesty Law Adopted *[TASS]* 77

Political & Social

Gorbachev Chairs Constitutional Commission Meeting *[TASS]* 77
Sakharov Says State of Emergency Not Ruled Out *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 77
Moscow TV's Korzin Interviews Yakovlev *[Korzin on Moscow TV]* 78
Resolution of Leningrad Rally Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Nov]* 82
New Moscow Party Chief Views First Tasks *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 84
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Opens 2-Day Session *[TASS]* 85
Azerbaijan National Front Announces 10-Day Strike *[Yerevan Radio]* 85
  Rail Transport Affected *[AFP]* 86
  More on Rail Disruptions *[Yerevan Radio]* 86
Journalist Denies Azeri Train Vandalism *[MOLODEZH AZERBAYDZHANA 21 Oct]* 86
Azerbaijani Law on Sovereignty Discussed *[Baku Radio]* 87
Armenian Elections To Be Held in Early 1990 *[Yerevan International]* 88
Vorkuta Miners' 'Latest' Demands Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Nov]* 88
Atmosphere at Vorkuta Pit Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 88
Leaders' Intolerance Blamed for Mine Strike *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 89
RSFSR Supreme Court Rejects Strikers' Appeal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Nov]* 90
Deputy Premier Ryabev on Miners' Dispute *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 91
Vorkuta Coal Strike Background Report *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Nov]* 95
Catholics Demonstrate in Ivano-Frankovsk *[Moscow International]* 98
Moldavia Changes Constitution, Election Laws *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 99
Changes in Belorussia Supreme Soviet Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Minsk Meeting Commemorates 1939 'Reunification' *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 99
New Conclusions Drawn on Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact *[Vilnius International]* 100
Estonian Komsomol May Be Dissolved 1 Mar *[Tallinn Radio]* 101
Attitudes of Latvians to Russians Deplored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Nov]* 101
Latvian Independence Anniversary Celebrated *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Nov]* 102
USSR Constitution Burned at Latvian Rally *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 2 Nov]* 102
Customs Seizes Drugs at Riga Port *[Moscow TV]* 104
Tajik Supreme Soviet Makes Personnel Changes *[Dushanbe Radio]* 104
Commentary on Solzhenitsyn, Other Writers *[Linnik on Moscow International]* 104
Medvedev Addresses Academy of Sciences Meeting *[TASS]* 105
Salayev Reelected Academy of Sciences President *[Baku Radio]* 105
Editorial Assesses Economic Reform Conference *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 105
Informals Hold Alternative Revolution Day Parade *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Nov]* 107
Article Highlights Current Social, Political Scene *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 11 Nov]* 107

Economic

Latest Price Policy Measures Explained *[TRUD 12 Nov]* 112
Krasnodar To Stagger Work Week To Save Power *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 114
Commission To Study Norilsk Gas Pipeline Blast *[TASS]* 115

Agricultural

Agricultural Report for 16-21 Nov Period *[Moscow Radio]* 115

Scientific

Cosmos '2,051' in Orbit; 'Functioning Normally' *[TASS]* 116
'Kvant-2' Systems Shut Down To Conserve Energy *[TASS]* 116
'Zenit' Booster Rocket in Final Test Stage *[Moscow International]* 116
Controversy Over South Urals AES Continues *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 116
Space Research Must Be 'Kept on Course' *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 118
High Funding for Arctic Research Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 120

Western Distrust of Disarmament Efforts Noted

90UI0134A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 18 Nov 89 p 1

[Article by Grigoriy Oganov, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA political commentator: "Peace or a 'Good Objective'"]

[Text] For a start—a couple of quotes from the Western press. "...In spite of this, we as a country, and the entire NATO organization, must remain vigilant and not relax efforts to equip our armed forces with the newest weapons...."

"...Current changes for the better in the international arena, including the 'peaceful actions' of the USSR, became possible entirely because of the 'firm position' of the West."

These are rather frequently encountered and entirely typical quotes taken from speeches of officials of Western states. The impression that is created is that some Western leaders would seem to want to acknowledge what is indisputable: The genuine love of peace which has been convincingly demonstrated by our country, the specific measures on the part of the USSR to reduce the military danger—measures that most frequently are unilateral—and the real steps being taken to put conversion into effect, that is, the conversion of military industry to the production of peaceful civilian products.

That is on the one hand. But on the other hand, they demonstrate an ineradicable desire to serve up all of these indisputable facts, to put it mildly, "in their own way:" As if they were forced, accepted under pressure, and dictated by circumstances. Or—if it can be managed—they are served up in a way that arouses distrust in us and raises doubts about the true intentions of the USSR, an insidious and cunning partner in the "game" of who beats who that takes place at a diplomatic level.

We, of course, might not react to this situation, to such an actually obsolete way of thinking of our partners in important negotiations, where a mechanism is being worked on for a transition from military confrontation to businesslike and honest cooperation, and which should radically change the mutual relations of the parties and the blocs. But we cannot disregard the pressure of a new kind of danger: The appearance of a habit of distrust and the necessity for "taking measures" according to old standards—by means of rearmament and up-arming (terms that in recent years have entered the lexicon of the militaristic circles of the Western countries), as if they were capable of ensuring the future peaceful development of international relations.

If the authors of these statements as a matter of fact think this way then we must dissuade them from these "convictions"; they do not in any way correspond to the actual state of affairs. Our foreign policy program is based on a deep study of both the situation that has developed in the international arena and the bitter experience of past years, when mutual distrust and suspicion corroded the vital fabric of relations between countries and peoples, pushing them into hasty, and by far not the best, actions dictated by fear and the so-called "hypothetical measures" which a confrontational side adopts after putting the other side in a disadvantageous position from a strategic standpoint.

Piling up "considerations" and "reflections" of this kind, Western militaristic circles in their propaganda scheme are attacking the public of their own countries, where recently antimilitaristic attitudes increased sharply under the influence of events that are taking place and, first and foremost, the perestroyka that is going on the the USSR and the changes in the social structure and "rules of behavior" of the countries of Eastern Europe. The NATO generals and admirals sadly are accusing this public of having "poor information" and an "incorrect" understanding of the situation, and of various "sins," the most serious of which is the demand for action in the direction of disarmament.

An example of this kind of "thick-headedness" in attitudes, formulated back in the days of the "cold war," is the point of view of the British secretary of state for defense, which was expressed the other day in statements of the secretary himself. They have to be presented to the reader in view of the typicalness of judgments of this kind.

Tom King, her majesty's secretary, laments the fact that the changes in the international situation establish the kind of political climate that "leads some people to the idea that defense is not necessary." The secretary misrepresents. It would be more correct to say "to the idea of the needlessness of the arms race." But this would not seem that stupid. But ,oh, what a desire there is to discredit the opponents. Afterwards, even to "attack" them: "It would be rash and even criminal to change our approach.... I do not foresee any changes in this area as long as the threat of the use of nuclear weapons against us exists...." Where did Mr. Secretary sense such a "threat"—this secret remains on his conscience.

Question—but why then is the secretary misrepresenting? To what good purpose?

Alas, the answer here is simple. The secretary reflects the attitudes of those conservatives who reject any steps to meet half way and who do not believe in the possibility of a world without wars, and a world without opposition and without confrontation. They are still in the past in ideas, convictions, and plans—in the same past where the main "fulcrum" was the Bomb....

It is good that the President of the United States does not share such "ideas."

Commentary on Possible U.S. Troop Cuts

LD2711221389 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Interviewed by foreign journalists last week, President George Bush said the changes in eastern Europe raised the possibility of U.S. troop reductions abroad. Vladislav Kozyakov has prepared the following commentary:

The President made reservations, suggesting the reductions will not be compulsory or unilateral. Even so, his statement indicates an awareness of the fact that the changing international situation requires new approaches on the part of the United States. Mr Bush pointed to a rapidity of change round the world. I am not suggesting, he added, that for evermore we'll have the same levels of troops anywhere—standing army, Europe, Korea, anywhere else. It is decades of cold war that forced Moscow and Washington to keep large armies and send parts of them abroad. At present more than 450,000 American troops, or nearly one-fourth of their total strength, are stationed at some 1,500 bases and other facilities in more than 30 countries. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops are deployed in allied European countries and Mongolia.

Now that Moscow and Washington have set put [as heard] to abolish the remaining cold war practices and say goodbye to confrontation, they must take a fresh look at the stay of their troops abroad. The Soviet Union has made the issue part of its new political thinking. This year and next it will reduce its troops by 500,000, pulling 50,000 from Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the German Democratic Republic. Moscow will also withdraw part of its troops currently stationed in Mongolia.

These unilateral moves are in no way linked with the Vienna talks on conventional forces in Europe. Washington has recently indicated it may shortly suggest larger reductions of Soviet and American troops deployed in the allied countries in Europe than those considered at Vienna. Whether or not it will do so perhaps become clear after the Soviet-American summit off the Maltese coast. In any event, the changing international situation calls for removal of foreign bases and troops around the globe as well as in individual regions. Last year the Soviet Union proposed that the bases and other forms of foreign military presence be abolished by the turn of the century. This could be achieved in several stages in one region after another with adequate security provided for one and all.

Belousov Discusses Ending Nuclear Tests

LD2511072689 Moscow TASS in English 2247 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Alma Ata November 25 TASS—A group of senior officials of union ministries and departments, headed by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Igor Belousov, has visited Soviet Kazakhstan for an all-round study of prospects of ending nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test range.

The leadership, public organisations, unofficial movements, work collectives and the people of Semipalatinsk and Soviet Kazakhstan have been insisting on the earliest solution of this problem. The "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" public organisations links the idea of closing the Semipalatinsk test range with an end of all nuclear tests in the United States.

During their visit to Semipalatinsk the delegation met representatives of work collectives, public organisations and unofficial movements.

Igor Belousov told TASS that the draft of a special government statement takes into account the wishes and demands of the population of this vast region. Belousov said he understood the local population's concern about the ongoing nuclear tests but added that they were extremely important for the country's security.

A careful study of the state of affairs on the test range convinced us that the explosions have not affected the radiological situation. It is the same as in Moscow, Leningrad and Alma Ata.

Belousov said that no nuclear blasts would be conducted near Semipalatinsk in December of 1989 and January 1990.

He further noted that under the Soviet-American agreement the yield of nuclear blasts has been halved. Besides, the Soviet Union has also halved the number of its nuclear tests. The Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, but the United States did not follow suit. Therefore, it is necessary to be ever more persistent in seeking a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

5-Year-Old Film Shown on Dismantling of Missiles

LD2011020189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 19 November on the "Seven Days" newscast carries a report with Political Observer Alekdsandr Tikhomirov on the dismantling of missiles in accordance with the SALT II Treaty. Tikhomirov opens by saying: "And now, as we promised, a 5-year-old reportage. You'll realize from the style in which it was done that it was indeed 5 years ago. But it is only today that we've been given the chance to broadcast it."

The film starts with an officer reading out an order to his men on dismantling a missile and silo, and then shows a shaft being uncovered and the warhead being disconnected, hauled out and put on a vehicle and driven away. It then shows part of another rocket, and concrete slabs being removed from the road leading to the launch silo. While this film is being shown, Tikhomirov's is heard saying the following: "We are dealing with facts that are either passed over in silence, or distorted in the U.S. press. So we hope that TV viewers in the United States will also be able to see this documentary footage.

"The warhead of a strategic missile is being decoupled. This is the way the dismantling of the whole complex starts. This is being done in our missile troops in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of strategic arms—SALT II. As you recall, it was signed in June 1979 by both sides, but was not ratified by the

United States. In spite of this, the Soviet Union stated at that time that it nevertheless firmly intended to implement this treaty if the United States also kept to its articles and points. In implementing such treaties our country sees a way to ending the arms race and calls on the United States to embark down this path.

"Since that time, particularly recently, the West has constantly been claiming that SALT II is a mirage, that it exists only on paper and is not being adhered to by the USSR.

"No, it is being followed and has been adhered to scrupulously and precisely throughout all the years since it was signed. If new missiles are deployed somewhere in our country or in the ocean on submarines, in other places missiles are being dismantled and their silos are being dismantled.

"During October and November, 20 such missile complexes were dismantled. The fuel was pumped off, all the unit systems were taken apart, the components made of valuable metals were removed and handed over for resmelting. The concrete roads leading to the silos were also dismantled."

The film then shows Tikhomirov standing with six officers. One gives an order to unseen men and two explosions are seen in a forest. Tikhomirov has the following remarks: "Today is 25 October 1984, it is 1159 Moscow time. This is the deployment area of one of the units of the strategic missile troops. In a few moments the cameras of Central Television will register the moment of another strategic missile silo's destruction. The unit which is doing this work was taken off alert duty a few days ago."

Tikhomirov is then seen turning to one of the officers who agrees that the United States could register this destruction in the next 24 hours or even more, if they haven't done so at the time. He goes on to explain some of the finer points of the agreement. The film shows that the silo is irrevocably destroyed, with a close up picture, and an aerial view.

Tikhomirov continues his remarks: "On the rare occasions when the United States dismantles missiles there is always a lot of talk about it in the United States. When it happens here, the Pentagon keeps quiet, although each time it has satellite photographs. For this reason, Soviet television is offering this video recording to all the television companies of the world. I would like to repeat one truth: The fulfilment of treaties is the most direct and the shortest way to concluding new ones."

Back in the studio he continues: "Why wasn't this report shown at that time, 5 years ago? I think that to a certain extent the unit commander was at fault. Before the filming, before the actual destruction, he ordered the entire old complex to be repainted. The generals of the general staff then aid unambiguously: This must not be shown, because our people will not understand it. The weapons look like they are new. I understand our military men, who bear a great responsibility toward the country. I can imagine how hard it is for them to restructure, to lift the cover of secrecy now here, now there, where of course this canot harm the country's defense capability. But surely we have the right to know things that the United States knows about us?"

Gremitskikh Conducts 27 Nov News Briefing

No Arms to El Salvador

LD2711145989 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—The Soviet Union has neither delivered nor delivers weapons to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, a news briefing in Moscow was told today.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh rejected attempts to prove Soviet involvement in an incident with a Cessna plane which was used to take ground-to-air missiles to El Salvador.

The Soviet Union favours the complete implementation of Central American peace agreements, including those provisions which foresee termination of aid to rebel movements and irregular troops in the region and the non-use of national territory for aggression against other states, Gremitskikh said.

The USSR continues to favour an immediate end to the senseless bloodshed in El Salvador and works to foster the necessary conditions for the resumption of an interrupted dialogue between warring sides, he said.

"We proceed from the need for the international community to render all-round assistance in attaining those goals and continue to take specific steps in that direction," he continued.

The Soviet spokesman urged both parties to the Salvadoran conflict to do everything possible to put an end to the current situation in the country, which hampers efforts to create a peaceful El Salvador.

Shelling of Kabul

LD2711152489 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—The rocket shelling of Kabul last Sunday was described by Yuriy Gremitskykh, a Soviet foreign ministry spokesman, as "an act of international terrorism". The action resulted in 31 dead and 96 wounded people.

This sanguinary assault, the spokesman said, has once again demonstrated to the world that the actions of anti-government Afghan factions are essentially criminal and incompatible with humanitarian principles.

On behalf of the Soviet people the spokesman expressed concern over Afghan opposition's continuing barbarous shellings of Afghan towns. The Soviet people, the spokesman said, urge those aiding and abetting the rebels, irresponsibly equipping them with sophisticated arms to be used against innocent people, to take steps to end these senseless crimes.

The realistic road to ending the bloodshed and fratricide in Afghanistan, the spokesman said, lies through a political settlement, national reconciliation, establishment of an inter- Afghan dialogue and a ceasefire.

A plan for such a settlement, not prejudicing the interests of the parties to the inter-Afghan conflict and opening the door for a free expression of the will by the Afghans, was put forward by President Najibullah in his address to the 9th conference of heads of state and government of non-aligned nations in Belgrade.

Gorbachev-Mitterrand Meeting

LD2711153189 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—A brief working meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Francois Mitterrand of France, to be held in Kiev on December 6, will continue a vigorous Soviet-French dialogue at the summit level on the most important issues of the European and international situation, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh believes the meeting will focus on the situation in Europe, specifically Central Europe, in the light of social and political changes that are gaining momentum in Eastern Europe.

The Soviet spokesman said France understands the situation and continues a policy of all-round cooperation with East European countries.

The two countries favour creating in Europe an atmosphere conductive to a constructive solution of problems, to the consolidation of stability and security and the prevention of unpredictable developments.

Gremitskikh said that this discussion will be particularly interesting and important because it will take place following a special summit of countries of the European Community that was convened on the initiative of France and discussed European affairs.

Besides that, the Soviet-French talks will be held several days after the superpower summit in the Mediterranean.

Mazowiecki Visit

LD2711232989 Warsaw PAP in Engish 2139 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 27—During a meeting with newsmen, Deputy spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry Yuriy Gremitskikh spoke about the course and outcome of the official visit paid by Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki to the USSR.

He said that the head of the Polish Government held talks with a great number of people both in Moscow and in other cities. During the meetings the sides touched upon Polish-Soviet relations, and exchanged opinions on key problems of the international situation.

At the Mazowiecki-Ryzhkov meeting, both premiers focused on economic relations between the two countries, possibilities for increasing their efficiency, coordination of basic directions and plans of economic growth in the years 1991-1995 as well as long-term concepts of development of Poland's national economy, the spokesman said.

Both sides stressed their will to expand good-neighbourly ties and the bonds of alliance on the basis of new political thinking. They confirmed their interest in developing intergovernmental contacts, enlivening cooperation in culture, science and education and expansion of direct human contacts.

They also talked about difficult problems in the history of relations between the two countries and agreed that clearing them up, and particularly the Katyn issue, would help remove negative burdens from the past that exist in these relations, and would strengthen friendship between the two nations.

TASS Roundup

LD2711180789 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—A brief working meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Francois Mitterrand of France, to be held in Kiev on December 6, will continue a vigorous Soviet-French dialogue at the summit level on the most important issues of the European and international situation, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh believes the meeting will focus on the situation in Europe, specifically central Europe, in light of social and political changes that are gaining momentum in Eastern Europe.

Speaking about the processes in Czechoslovakia, Gremitskikh said events in that country continue to develop dynamically."In our view, the events in Czechoslovakia get objective coverage in the Soviet mass media." The USSR welcomes the new dialogue between representatives of various political orientations and expresses hope that it will promote the renewal of socialism in Czechoslovakia, he said.

On the results of the visit by Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki to the USSR, which ended today, the spokesman said that the sides held substantial talks on a wide range of Soviet-Polish relations and exchanged views on key international issues. They stressed the resolve to promote the development of good-neighbourly and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Poland on the basis of new political thinking and reaffirmed their commitment to all-round cooperation.

The Soviet Union has neither delivered nor delivers weapons to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front and favours the complete implementation of central American peace accords, Gremitskikh said commenting on an incident with a Cessna plane that was used to take ground-to-air missiles to El Salvador and on attempts to prove Soviet involvement.

The spokesman said that a joint tripartite commission on southwestern Africa is meeting near Pretoria in South Africa. Taking part in it from the Soviet side are ambassador for special assignments Vyacheslav Ustinov and head of the Foreign Ministry's Africa department Yuriy Yukalov.

The briefing was addressed by Kabul's Mayor 'Abdul Kerim Misaq, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Council. Misaq briefed journalists on the situation in the Afghan capital and stressed that forces hostile to the central government seek to destabilise the situation in the city and to cause hunger.

The Kabul mayor also told journalists about the decision of Kabul's Council to send special messages requesting relief for the residents of Kabul to the mayors of major cities of the world, the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly and religious centres.

Gremitskikh Interviewed on CPCZ Changes

LD2511183889 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1600 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Yuriy Gremitskikh, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, answered questions today from a CTK correspondent concerning the results of the CPCZ [Communist Party of Czechoslovakia] Central Committee session. He stressed at that time that the decisions being made in fraternal socialist countries are internal decisions which are being done by the political leaders of sovereign states. The main wish and interest of the Soviet Union is for these decisions to benefit the further development and renewal of socialism. Gremitskikh hopes our new party leader, Comrade Karel Urbanek, will find solutions corresponding to the demand and wishes of the people, and for the Czechoslovak Communists in cooperation with the people to overcome the present difficulties.

The Soviet spokesman also answered a question on how he sees the events in Czechoslovakia in the context of European socialist countries and the European process as a whole. He stressed that these are dramatic and difficult events. They are worrying many people in friendly countries and also in the West. It is necessary, Gremitskikh said, for the reforms which are being declared and implemented in East European countries to lead to political, economical, and psychological stability. He then called illusory the view that deep reforms can be carried out without stability in individual countries on the whole European continent without stability between East and West. Reforms require stability and at the same time they have to serve this stability, the Soviet spokesman stressed.

The CTK correspondent then noted that one of the points of the resolution of the CPCZ Central Committee session in Prague declare loyalty to the alliance obligations with the Soviet Union and obligations which Czechoslovakia has undertaken within the CEMA framework and within the Warsaw Pact and asked what Yuriy Gremitskikh had to say in this connection.

The Soviet spokesman expressed deep satisfaction with the fact that our new party leadership adopted such an important resolution at the session. He noted that in making any kind of decision, in all internal political changes, the preservation, strengthening, and further development of cooperation and friendship between socialist countries has to be the center of attention in all socialist countries. This cooperation and this friendship is needed for the development of our economies and cultures and for the preservation of peace and stability in Europe, Soviet spokesman Gremitskikh stressed.

Gremitskikh on CSSR Situation, 1968 Events

LD2711192689 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy director of the Information Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, spoke this afternoon with journalists about the developments in Czechoslovakia.

He said that the Soviet Union welcomes a dialogue with representatives of various political persuasians in Czechoslovakia and expressed hope that this dialogue would contribute to the renewal of socialism. He noted at the same time that the present events are an internal affair of the Czechoslovak people.

In reply to a question concerning the Soviet stand towards 1968, the Soviet representative stressed: If the events of that time must be re-assessed, then this must be done by all—this concerns also Czechoslovak comrades, including those who then appealed to Warsaw Pact member states under the shield of healthy forces in Czechoslovakia, and this also concerns Warsaw Pact countries. The present stand of the Soviet Union, which has been explained several times by the Soviet leadership, dwells in the fact, Yuriy Gremitskikh noted, that the present processes in socialist states are their internal affairs, and the parties and governments of these countries bear full responsibility for them before their nations. The Soviet Union supports the view that threats or use of force are inadmissible. Concerning the possible meeting of top representatives of the Warsaw Pact member states which would be held in Moscow, Yuriy Gremitskikh neither confirmed nor denied it, however.

The delay in sending a letter of congratulations by Mikhail Gorbachev to Karel Urbanek, he explained by the further session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee and the weekend days off. He said that one should not look for anything hidden or dramatic in this; the telegram is no doubt on the way and will be published in tomorrow's Soviet press.

Italian-Soviet Magazine DIALOGUE Launched

LD2411224789 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—A special issue of the new Italian-Soviet magazine DIALOGUE, dealing with economic, industrial, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation between the two countries, was announced at the Foreign Ministry press centre today.

The issue carries Mikhail Gorbachev's greetings to the reader, noting that perestroika paves the way for the integration of the Soviet economy into the world economic system. The Italian business world, with which the Soviet Union has traditionally good relations, can promote this integration better than other countries and benefit from it, Gorbachev said.

The magazine, to be printed in Italy by the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce and the major Italian publisher Class Editorial, wil be available on a regular basis from next January.

Conference of Socialist, Other News Agencies Held

PM2111142989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conference of News Agencies' Leaders"]

[Text] Budapest, 15 Nov—The annual conference of the leaders of 16 socialist and developing states' news agencies and press agencies has opened here. The Soviet information service is represented by TASS and APN.

United States & Canada

Bush, Thatcher Discuss Upcoming Malta Meeting

LD2511091889 Moscow TASS in English 0911 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 25 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin:

Talks between U.S. President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who stayed in the United States on a one-day working visit, were held at the Camp David presidential retreat outside Washington on Friday.

The meeting centered on issues related to East-West relations and European stability, Presidential Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said.

President Bush summarised plans for the Malta meeting and the two leaders discussed a number of possible subjects to be considered at that meeting, Fitzwater said.

"The President and the prime minister discussed reforms under way in the Soviet Union and agreed on support for glasnost and perestroika," Fitzwater said. "They both emphasised the pursuit of democracy as the first step in the reform process."

An understanding on the need to maintain European stability, NATO, and strong defence of the West was also reached during the talks.

The U.S. President and the British prime minister also discussed the state of affairs in the Common Market and regional issues.

Speaking at a news conference after the talks Mrs. Thatcher described changes and achievements in the Soviet Union as colossal.

In response to a request to say how, in her view, Soviet-American relations will develop under the Bush administration, as compared to those under the Reagan administration, the British prime minister said she did not think that the quality of relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union would change.

She said she expected the Malta summit would be "a very good one, and I am quite certain that any results which eventually emerge will be sound and long-term."

Mrs. Thatcher said the forthcoming Malta meeting will provide an opportunity to prepare a successful summit between the Soviet and American presidents next year to make significant decisions.

The British prime minister emphasised that a fine system had been worked out of late for the discussion of various problems "with both Mr. Bush and Mr. Gorbachev, and our European colleagues."

Mrs. Thatcher left the United States later in the day.

Bessmertynkh, Matlock Discuss Ties, Meeting

LD1711212189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1226 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS)—USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Besssmertnykh today received U.S. Ambassador in Moscow Jack Matlock at the latter's request. Questions of Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed in light of the upcoming meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States near Malta, as well as a few regional problems.

Cheney's Concept of U.S. Armed Forces Examined

LD2711230289 Moscow TASS in English 2245 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

In connection with the need to cut the Pentagon's budget in the years ahead, U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney advanced a new concept for the structure of the U.S. Armed Forces which, specifically, envisages the preservation of U.S. preponderance in naval armaments and the continued modernisation of strategic nuclear weapon systems, regardless of what is being done or will be done in the USSR. The U.S. defence secretary declared that a most important task of the United States is to maintain technological superiority over the USSR.

In an interview to LOS ANGELES TIMES, Cheney said that the United States is a superpower and will always be needing a potential for the use of power to protect U.S. interests and preserve U.S. influence on world events. As an argument in favour of a strong navy, Cheney declared that it is effective for the ensurance of U.S. interests in regional conflicts.

The U.S. defence secretary believes that the maintenance of the potential of strategic nuclear forces is justified by their low production and maintenance costs as compared with conventional forces.

The chief of the Pentagon proposes to make cuts in the military budget above all at the expense of the U.S. land forces, and to make European allies to shoulder the burden of the maintenance of NATO conventional forces.

According to Cheney's plan, the United States should play a more active role under naval obligations and predominance in the air, with European members of the alliance concentrating on land-based combat operations.

One gets the impression that Cheney's concept is the continuation of the U.S. power politics, that it envisages the preservation of old priorities in creating a large potential for projecting the military might far beyond the limits of the United States territory.

The maintenance of the U.S. superiority on high seas and domination in the air remain the chief tasks of the military agency.

The novelty of Cheney's proposals lies in the fact that the Pentagon chief, as a result of redistribution of "defence functions" intends to make the United States' European allies to shoulder the main burden of military expenditures.

Cheney asserts that his concept reflects the present strategic correlation of forces when the United States has a strong navy, while the Soviet Union is a major power for land-based armaments.

It should be noted however that while negotiations to level out conventional forces and armaments are under way in Vienna, the United States refuses even to discuss the idea of negotiating to reduce naval forces.

Does this mean that the United States is applying a double standard again?

Cheney To Attend NATO Meetings 28-29 Nov

LD2611215889 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 26 TASS—U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney flew to Western Europe on Saturday to participate in an annual session of the NATO Military Planning Committee, which will be held in Brussels between November 28-29.

The meeting of the defence ministers of the North Atlantic Alliance will be devoted mainly to discussing the situation in East European countries and the West's response to democratic changes there.

The AP [ASSOCIATED PRESS] news agency reports that, despite these developments in Eastern Europe, Cheney intends to defend the need for NATO preservation. He will assure his allies that the United States will stick to its financial obligations to the bloc in 1990.

This element will be of special importance now that the Pentagon examines plans to cut its military spending by 180 billion dollars in 1992-1994.

Other issues on the agenda include arms control and the ongoing talks on cuts in conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Before the committee begins its session, Cheney will visit the Netherlands where he will meet Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers.

Soviet-U.S. Military Group's Talks Reported

LD2111073689 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—"The latest round of the Soviet-American military working group's negotiations, held here on November 13-20, was devoted to the elaboration of practical measures to put into effect the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of dangerous military activities," Major General Anatoliy Bolyatko, deputy chief of a department at the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and leader of the Soviet delegation, told TASS.

The American delegation was headed by Major General George Sewell.

According to General Bolyatko, the sides discussed the implementation of the agreement signed this summer. "The success of our negotiations with General Sewall was made possible by the general improvement of Soviet-American relations, including in the military sphere", the general stressed.

Bolyatko expressed hope that the sides would be able to work out practical measures to put the agreement into effect before the year is out, as envisaged in that document.

U.S. Conservatives Urge Hard Line on USSR

PM2111153989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Major General A. Bolyatko, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, by M. Ponomarev: "Pittsburgh Meetings: Harmony and Discord"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The fifth meeting of representatives of the U.S. and USSR public on problems of Soviet-U.S. and international relations has been held in Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania). Major General A. Bolyatko, deputy chief of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, took part in its work. He shares his impressions in a conversation with a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent.

[Ponomarev] First of all, Anatoliy Viktorovich, we would like to hear from you about the point and significance of the meeting held in Pittsburgh.

[Bolyatko] The idea of holding such meetings came from the U.S Institute of Chautauqua. This idea received active support both in the United States and the USSR. Such meetings have been held every year since 1985 either in the United States or in the Soviet Union. Eminent statesmen and politicians of both countries and representatives of broad sections of the public take part in them. The current Soviet delegation, for example, is made up of USSR people's deputies, ministers and diplomats, scientists and journalists, military men and economists, workers and collective farm workers, cultural workers and clergymen —altogether around 200 people.

I would say that these meetings have become a real barometer showing the state of Soviet-U.S. relations. At the same time, they are a clear manifestation of people's diplomacy and its direct link with traditional and official diplomacy and their fruitful influence on each other.

[Ponomarev] From what you say, the atmosphere at the meeting was benevolent and constructive. But how is the U.S public reacting to perestroyka in our country, and how, in your view, do they see the long-term development of Soviet-U.S relations?

[Bolyatko] One of the newspapers wrote something like: The participants in the Pittsburgh meeting are bathing in a sea of goodwill—and this honestly cannot be called an exaggeration. I can confirm that this evaluation is close to the truth. Although the speakers at the plenary sessions and "roundtables," or the people just exchanging opinions in the lobbies, as they say, were by no means always in agreement with each other, and sometimes they even had serious arguments, all the same the desire to understand each other remained a determining factor. The announcement made during the work of the forum in Pittsburgh about the upcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush in the Mediterranean provoked great interest and approval among the participants in the forum. An episode that I would call symbolic has stayed in my mind. The head of our delegation, V. Tereshkova, presented the American participants in the meeting with a model of a bell. "May the sound of this bell always be a sound of hope and friendship," she said. In the final analysis, there was such an atmosphere.

[Ponomarev] Your words "in the final analysis" create the impression that in Pittsburgh there were also voices that spoiled the general harmony and struck a discordant note, so to speak.

[Bolyatko] Yes, unfortunately this is true. The speech of U.S. Defense Undersecretary P. Wolfowitz must primarily be mentioned here. It clearly did not fit the general tone. Although this speech was dedicated to an important but relatively specific question—regional conflicts—it was essentially a policy speech and contained sharp criticism of the Soviet Union's policies. Note that this is not just my impression. It was described in this way in an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES. The tone of the speech, the newspaper writes, was accusatory, reflecting attempts by the Pentagon to label Moscow as the source of any potential unpleasantness.

Let us dwell on individual points in the Pentagon representative's speech. He affirmed, for example, that the successes achieved in Soviet-U.S relations so far might not develop any further through the fault of the Soviet side. "In the middle of all this 'new thinking' the old policies are preserved in many things in the Soviet Union," the speaker announced, with regional conflicts primarily but not exclusively in mind. His speech sounded like an attempt to portray Moscow as the source of all possible misfortunes on this planet.

Thus, Soviet military assistance to the legal Government of the Republic of Afghanistan as well as to the DPRK, which, he said, "has possibly already started developing its own nuclear weapons," was discussed with unconcealed condemnation. Soviet supplies of weapons to a number of other countries forced to protect their independence from external threats, including Nicaragua, were denounced. These supplies and other actions, the speaker said, are aimed at expanding the USSR's influence in the developing countries, which is apparently a direct challenge to the United States and its national security interests.

All these affirmations do not stand up to criticism. It can be recalled, for example, that it was the Soviet Union that proposed to the United States that arms supplies both to the Afghan Government and to the armed opposition be stopped, but the United States ignored this proposal. The consistent stance of the DPRK on liberating the Korean peninsula from nuclear weapons and turning the peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone is well known to the whole world. In its recent statement the DPRK Ministry of Foreign Affairs reaffirmed Pyongyang's commitment not to test, manufacture, bring in, or site nuclear weapons on its territory. It is also well known that the Soviet Union has suspended its supplies of weapons to Nicaragua under an agreement with the Nicaraguan Government.

No, the Soviet Union does not desire an expansion in its influence in the developing countries, but a peaceful political settlement to regional conflicts, and the Pentagon cannot fail to realize this. The Geneva agreements and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the USSR's contribution to settling the situation in Angola and Namibia, its active support for the efforts of the five Central American states in the normalization of the situation in the region, and many other facts cannot be refuted by anyone.

However, in his speech in Pittsburgh P. Wolfowitz did not just restrict himself to his own interpretation of the USSR's role in regional conflicts. He tried to show the Soviet leadership directly how they should behave in certain instances, and somehow pressure the Soviet Union in a direction that would suit the Pentagon. Indeed, its representative did not balk at warning Moscow against taking measures to suppress "nationalist and democratic" movements within the USSR and its allied countries. And this is at a time when the Soviet leadership has declared several times that all peoples have the right to choose, to determine their country's future themselves, to choose their own system and regime themselves. No one can interfere from outside on any pretext or impose their ideas on another country's policy.

This is the USSR's fundamental stance, and in my opinion it should also be respected by our partners, who should also not impose on us their ideas on our policy and activity. Nor, moreover, should they seek a further large-scale unilateral reduction of armed forces by us, as the U.S. deputy defense minister's speech stated. It would be far more logical to talk about reciprocal steps that the U.S side could take in response to our initiatives in this sphere.

[Ponomarev] Anatoliy Viktorovich, is this, in your opinion, the personal point of view of one of the Pentagon's representatives or the stance of certain U.S. circles?

[Bolyatko] I think that the speech in question was not accidental or an isolated incident, but an expression of U.S. right-wing conservative circles' desire not to allow any further improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. It hardly differs from the skeptical statements and declarations made recently by U.S politicians such as Vice President D. Quayle, Defense Secretary R. Cheney, Deputy Secretary of State L. Eagleburger, Deputy National Security Adviser R. Gates, and a number of others.

The way Wolfowitz timed his address is also worth noting. He spoke immediately after G. Bush announced his upcoming meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, which is to take place in December. It seems to me that the Pentagon and the U.S. military-industrial complex in general wish to impose their policy on the country's political leadership at the upcoming meeting in the Mediterranean, to lead the President and his entourage into taking a tough stance with respect to the Soviet Union, which they say must be "contained" within the "limits of behavior" dictated by the United States and enticed with small concessions in the economic sphere.

[Ponomarev] What was the attitude of the participants in the meeting in Pittsburgh to this speech, and what was the reaction to it among the U.S. public?

[Bolyatko] I have the impression that this reaction was well reflected in THE NEW YORK TIMES article I have already mentioned. It simply condemns the Pentagon representative's attitude to Soviet-U.S. relations. And not only that. Recent public opinion polls show that over three-fourths of Americans approve of G. Bush's work as President, and this very high rating—in U.S. terms—is to a great extent connected with the attitude to relations with the USSR that has been developed by the head of the White House.

[Ponomarev] So it looks as though we have a basis for optimism?

[Bolyatko] Undoubtedly. But the opponents of further Soviet-U.S. interaction are not laying down their arms. It was not just Wolfowitz who brought discord into the harmony of the meetings in Pittsburgh. Very influential forces across the ocean want to prevent it in Soviet-U.S. relations, and sober realistic politicians cannot fail to take this into account.

Israeli-U.S. Strategic Cooperation Viewed

TA1911180689 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Commentary by Dimitriy Prokofiev]

[Text] Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir this week held talks with U.S. President Bush, Secretary of State James Baker, and Defense Secretary Richard Cheney in Washington. The parties discussed the development of the political process in the Middle East, ways to promote the plan for elections in the territories, and the problems arising in relations between the two countries.

The talks in Washington, writes our commentator Dimitriy Prokofiev, naturally focused on Shamir's initiative and Secretary Baker's five-point plan. No significant breakthrough occurred there, which was natural, because the parties' stands are close in any event. The chances of implementing the Israeli-U.S. plan currently depend on the PLO's reply to the secretary of state's proposals.

The nature of this reply is difficult to predict at this stage. On the one hand, the Palestinian leadership has opted for a political solution and is presumably capable of giving the delegation from the territories a green light for election-related negotiations. On the other hand, however, both Washington and Mr Shamir's movement have taken a most inflexible stance on the question of the PLO role in the political process, depriving 'Arafat of the opportunity to embrace the U.S. initiative.

The future of the political process is, then, very vague. On another important issue, however, the stands were patently clear. I am referring to the supply of U.S. arms to the Middle East. In his talk with Richard Cheney, Mr Shamir expressed his stringent objection to the administration's decision to sell over 100 modern tanks to Saudi Arabia which, as is known, has never maintained peace relations with Israel. I understand the prime minister's concern: The balance of power on the eastern front—strategically, the most dangerous—is being broken, and it is to be presumed that in order to enhance national security, the Jewish state will be obliged to resort to countermeasures.

Cheney's reply, however, was unequivocal: The administration sees it as its duty to support pro-Western regimes in the region. This means that the tanks will be sold to Saudi Arabia in any event. To compensate Israel, his excellency the secretary proposed to further extend the scope of strategic cooperation in the sphere of defense.

I can see the following scenario quite clearly: The Saudis will receive the tanks, which they probably need against Iran, first and foremost, although—who knows? After that, in the framework of the strategic cooperation agreement, Israel, too, will purchase sophisticated weapons in the sum of $1.8 billion in U.S. military aid. They will be able to make purchases far beyond that.

At this point, the Arabs will become angry. Having secured their east side, they will find their west side endangered again. Saudi Arabia has the money to buy endless quantities of weapons in the international market, where it receives numerous offers. Israel will then resort to a countermove, launching another round of the macabre merry-go-round, at the conclusion of which the angel of death slays the slaughterer.

Could I be exaggerating? For this scenario is not compatible with U.S. attempts to promote the peace process in the Middle East. True, it is not. The impression, however, is that today the United States conducts two kinds of policy in the region—and not only in this region. The first, that of the State Department, is designed to ease tension in conflict areas, mainly in a bid to pave the road to a rapprochement with the East. In contrast, there is the Pentagon policy, which is influenced by the calculations of the military-industrial establishment, which has gained considerable representation in the Defense Department during the total confrontation [ha'immut hatotali] years.

It is utterly possible that the contrast is an indispensable facet in the era of radical changes in throughout the international relationships network. The United States is not the only one to have two simultaneous political lines: an old and a new one. This makes no difference to Israel, however. Yitzhaq Shamir has shown that he is aware of the danger, and he has warned Cheney that his policy will only prompt another round of the arms race in the Middle East. The truth is that he is completely right.

It should only be added that Jerusalem could perhaps halt this dangerous process had the national leadership not given supreme priority to strategic cooperation with the United States, cooperation which occasionally results in the subjugation of the national interests to those of Israel's ally across the ocean.

Bush Condemns Murder of Lebanese President

LD2311065789 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 22 TASS—U.S. President George Bush expressed indignation over the murder of recently elected president of Lebanon Rene Mu'awwad who was killed as a result of a terroristic act in Beirut today.

Speaking on board a military aircraft which brought him to Memphis, Tennessee, the U.S. President expressed grief at the death of President Rene Mu'awwad.

George Bush said that this "disgraceful terroristic happening" is condemned by the United States.

He said the murder should not be a setback to the effort to bring peace to Lebanon.

"I would like to offer the help of America to bring these killers to justice," George Bush said, without specifying how this help will be manifested.

Bush Signs Budget Bills; Allocations Detailed

LD2211124389 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Orekhov:

President Bush signed on Tuesday night a number of important budget bills for the 1990 fiscal year, one of them allocating 286 billion dollars to the Pentagon. 3.8 billion dollars are earmarked for the Star Wars programme—1.1 billion dollars less than initially requested by the President.

Bush was disappointed with the cut and expressed hope that Congress would support his SDI requests with greater enthusiasm.

As much as 4.3 billion dollars will go to build two B-2 stealth bombers next year—430 million dollars and one plane less than the White House had planned. Part of the money will be used to prepare the manufacture of five more B-2 bombers in 1991. 1.1 billion dollars will be used for programmes to deploy MX strategic missiles and mobile Midgetman missiles.

The President also signed into law a bill allocating 157 [word indistinct] to the Labour Department and the Department of Health and Human Services. From this sum 1.6 billion dollars are allocated to combat AIDS. Large sums to combat the disease are also planned in the 44 billion dollar bill on the budget of the Department of Agriculture, local development programmes and food programmes for needy Americans, signed by the President.

A bill allocating almost 12 billion dollars for transportation was also endorsed. Over 25 per cent of the total. 3.2 billion dollars, will fund the government's anti-drug addiction programme.

At the last moment the President vetoed a bill to form a special congressional commission to settle an Eastern Airlines employee strike that has been under way for eight months. The bill would have gone into effect without Bush's signature on Tuesday night, but the President vetoed it 25 minutes before midnight.

The decision taken by the President, who has repeatedly declared against governmental interference in company-employee conflicts, strikes a blow to the strikers' hope for congressional mediation to find a way out of the crisis.

Budget Prompts U.S. To Curb Soviet Immigrants

PM2311143589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Limit on 'Refugees'"]

[Text] "Fifteen years ago, the United States informed the Soviet Union that it could not hope to establish friendly relations and significantly expand trade with the United States until it allowed a far greater number of Soviet Jews to emigrate to any country they want. But now that Mikhail Gorbachev has fully met the Americans' demands, the U.S. Government has started sharply reducing the number of Soviet Jews allowed into the country. This is a paradox full of political irony." THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER commented thus on the U.S. Administration's decision to limit the flow of immigrants, who have decided to leave the USSR for various reasons, into the United States.

As already reported, Washington introduced a 6-month waiting period for Soviet citizens who have no relatives in the United States and deprived them of refugee status. The administration also restricted the number of Soviet refugees next year to 50,000. The reason for these steps, THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER writes, is that the U.S. side's expenses in providing transport and accommodation for each Jewish refugee from the Soviet Union amount to the considerable sum of $7,000, and the federal government is experiencing an acute shortage of budget funds.

Soviet-U.S. Trade Commission Concludes Session

PM2311142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talks Concluded"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Nov—The 11th session of the Joint Soviet-U.S. Commission for Questions of Trade has ended its work. "Both sides at the session proceeded from the premise that a new stage has begun in ties between our countries, a stage determined by consistent implementation of the policy of improving relations which is pursued by the USSR and U.S. leaders," K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations and leader of the Soviet delegation, declared at a press conference held here.

He noted that, in terms of dynamism, trade and economic ties between the USSR and the United States are lagging behind the development of relations in other spheres. But now there is an opportunity to make an optimistic appraisal of the future in this sphere as well.

"We have taken several important steps and I believe that, as a result of this, our trade relations will significantly improve," Robert Mosbacher, U.S. Secretary of Commerce and head of the U.S. delegation, pointed out in his turn. He emphasized that President G. Bush's administration is striving to "expand peaceful trade with the Soviet Union, without weakening U.S. national security. Our administration wishes success to perestroyka. In practical terms, we wish to help U.S. business learn how to do business in a changing Soviet Union."

Both countries' ministers noted that the Soviet-U.S. commission laid down new cooperation guidelines—between Soviet cooperatives and U.S. companies and between U.S. states and oblasts in the Soviet Union in the sphere of consumer goods production. The sides agreed to organize a number of new working groups.

During the session's work K.F. Katushev and USSR Ambassador to the United States Yu.V. Dubinin were received by U.S. Vice President D. Quayle. The Soviet minister also had conversations with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker and leaders of the U.S. Congress.

TASS Reports U.S. Interest in Trade Ties

LD2611230489 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 26—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

As the date of the Soviet-American unofficial summit draws nearer, interest among business, political and academic circles of the United States in the development of trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union is growing.

They express hope that the positive tendencies that have become visible in the Soviet-U.S. inter-state dialogue will be given a new impetus during the shipboard meeting in the Mediterranean off the coast of Malta and will provide a basis for the two countries' economic cooperation.

The development of trade and economic contacts will give an opportunity to strengthen bilateral relations still further and promote better mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, William Forrester, president of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC), believes.

The two countries' drawing closer together by means of trade and economic contacts and their deliverance from every kind of discriminatory restrictions will raise Soviet-American cooperation to a new level and will improve prospects in the economic sphere, he told TASS.

The Malta meeting should remove such an anachronism as obstacles to Soviet-American trade and should primarily promote the lifting of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, said John Steinbruner, director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institutions.

He also supported the idea of granting membership to the Soviet Union in such international economic organisations as the general agreement on tariffs and trade and the International Monetary Fund, and the granting of credits of the Export-Import Bank to the USSR within the context of normalising the West's economic relations with the Soviet Union.

Michael Mandelbaum, director of the project on East-West relations at the Council on Foreign Relations, pointed out the untenability and harm of the politisation of the American approach to trade with the USSR.

The time has come to recognise that the Soviet Union pursues a new liberal emigration policy and to grant the most-favoured-nation trading status to it, he emphasised.

This would signify that Soviet commodities would reach the American market on a par with the commodities of other countries and that the U.S. will lift trade barriers in the form of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, adopted in 1974, he added.

The U.S. President is vested with powers to break these artificial barriers, and to clear the way for the conclusion of comprehensive trade agreements with the Soviet Union, he said.

The American expert believes that the abrogation of the U.S. discriminatory trade legislation would serve to normalise relations between the two great powers, make the American international economic policy healthier and strengthen the policy of relaxation of tension in relations with the Soviet Union.

Need Seen for Impetus to U.S.-Soviet Trade

LD2711154889 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—By TASS commentator Andrey Orlov: "It takes two to tango" President Reagan used to say when he waited for a response from President Gorbachev. But the world has changed and today the West no longer doubts the Soviet president's sincerity. Now it is up to Reagan's successor to prove his readiness for a fully-fledged dialogue with the USSR, including in bilateral trade which, paradoxically, is not regulated by any legal documents.

The trade agreement signed fifteen years ago has not been ratified by Congress and various amendments to domestic legislation are in force in the United States. They prevent the Soviet Union from trading with the United States on an equal footing. All this, it is clear, does not contribute to the expansion of trade between the two great powers.

Hopes have however appeared lately for a thaw in this frozen domain of bilateral dialogue. The first U.S. commercial exhibition in Moscow last October showed how keenly interested U.S. businessmen are in trade with the USSR. The commission on trade between the two countries has recently found the situation abnormal and decided to get down de facto to the elaboration of a new commercial agreement.

A working group has been formed to study its practical aspects. Another team of experts will study questions pertaining to the mutual protection of investments. The results of their work could provide the basis for negotiations on an appropriate agreement between the USSR and the United States.

And, last but not least, negotiations are planned on a new bilateral taxation agreement. U.S. legislation has changed somewhat since the old agreement was signed and new foreign trade partners have appeared in the USSR—cooperatives, joint enterprises, etc.

On the eve of the summit meeting off Malta it is pertinent to say that a new political decision is needed to give a powerful impetus not only to trade, but to the entire complex of bilateral relations, to make positive world changes irreversible. The powerful process of democratisation in the USSR, which is assuming legislative form, shows that the USSR is prepared for such a decision. It is not up to the Americans.

Petrovskiy Receives Carnegie Council Chairman

PM2011152189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS "Official Report"]

[Text] On 13 November USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy received a delegation from the U.S. Carnegie Corporation public organization, headed by Carnegie Council Chairman E. Kaplan. Attention was focused on the new prospects for Soviet-U.S cooperation in the sphere of strengthening international security. Emphasis was placed on the importance of constructive efforts by the public in the two countries to create a climate of trust and stability in international relations.

Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement To Visit U.S.

LD2411224589 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—"Representatives of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement will leave for the United States on November 26 to discuss the possibility of coordinated Soviet-U.S public actions against the continuation of nuclear weapons tests in the United States and the Soviet Union.

"The anti-test champions will meet leaders of U.S anti-war organisations, including the 'American Peace Test' and the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War' organisation," a spokesman of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement Olzhas Suleymenov said at a press conference here.

"The Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement," Suleymenov stressed "is the first mass anti-nuclear movement in the USSR. It was formed in February 1989 when an ejection of radio-active gas was detected after a test explosion on the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing ground in Kazakhstan. The movement wants nuclear tests to be stopped immediately, primarily in its own country. It also calls for the closing of nuclear testing grounds in the United States and in other countries."

According to Suleymenov, the movement has already achieved initial successes. Only seven out of the 18 nuclear explosions planned for this year have been set off in Semipalatinsk, Olzhas Suleymenov said. The Soviet leadership has decided not to carry out nuclear tests there through the end of the year. The fate of the testing ground will be determined next year.

"The Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement", he said, "also intends to announce an initiative to set up an international parliamentary association for a nuclear-free world, since mankind's survival is now a global problems."

Last August the USSR Supreme Soviet called on the U.S. Congress to discuss the possibility of a bilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, but no official reply has so far been received.

"We are disturbed by this silence," Suleymenov stressed. "This is why we have decided this time to appeal not to governments or parliament members, but to the electorate, the most active part of the world's population."

Parliamentarians to U.S. for Human Rights Seminar

LD2511134989 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—A Soviet Supreme Soviet delegation left Moscow for the United States today to attend the Second Soviet-U.S. Interparliamentary Seminar on Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights.

The delegation is led by Fedor Burlatskiy, chairman of the Subcommittee for Humanitarian, Scientific and Cultural Relations of the Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee.

Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney's USSR Visit

Arrival in Kiev 22 Nov

LD2311163989 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Kiev November 22 TASS—Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, on an official visit in the Soviet Union, today arrived in Kiev, the capital of the Soviet Ukraine.

At Borispol Airport, where the state flags of Canada, the Soviet Union and the Ukraine were hoisted, Brian Mulroney and his wife were met by Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitaliy Masol and his wife, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Vladimir Kravets, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kiev City Council Valentin Zgurskiy, and other officials. Young people, dressed in Ukainian national costumes, presented flowers to the wife of the Canadian prime minister.

Canadian and Soviet officials, accompanying the Canadian prime minister on his trip of the Soviet Union, also arrived in Kiev.

The streets of the city that were passed by the motorcade escorted by motorcycles were decked with the state flags of Canada, the USSR and the Ukraine.

IZVESTIYA Interview With Mulroney

PM2111123989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney by IZVESTIYA special correspondents A. Shalnev: "Brian Mulroney: I Hope the Visit Will Be Constructive"]

[Text] Ottawa—The last time a Canadian prime minister paid an official visit to the Soviet Union—it was Pierre Elliott Trudeau—was in 1971. I began my interview with the current prime minister, Brian Mulroney, who arrives in the USSR at the beginning of next week, by asking him had it not taken too long, nearly two decades, to organize the next visit.

"Indeed it has been too long," the prime minister agreed, but he pointed out that he himself had been to Moscow in spring 1985, to attend K.U. Chernenko's funeral, although it had not been an official visit.

"That is why," Brian Mulroney said, "I hope that this visit is substantive enough to demonstrate the importance of relations between our countries and confirm the need for more active meetings between the two states' leaders."

Over 250 Canadian businessmen will be traveling to the USSR with the prime minister. "They are not going in order to have a good time," he said. "I have a list of projects on which agreements will be signed during the visit. I am talking about direct investments, worth, according to the most conservative estimates, $1 billion [Canadian dollars]. And this sum could increase considerably... I believe this step will be concrete evidence of the readiness of Canada, its government, and its business circles to support what President Gorbachev is doing. You would hardly be able to get Canadian businessmen to invest money like this unless they believe that the reforms are constructive. I don't know about anyone else, but for us $1 billion is an enormous sum. Never before have Canadians taken the steps they intend to take now. Words and declarations are one thing, the willingness to give support is quite another. I hope the entire visit will be constructive."

[Shalnev] One senior representative of your administration said at a briefing that Canada would like to contribute to the success of the reforms in the Soviet Union. Could you explain what he means exactly?

[Mulroney] There are various ways and means. We have just been talking about one... Mr Gorbachev is one of the major reformers of our time. Canada is right behind what he is doing. We have neither the right nor the intention to tell others what to do in their own countries. It is up to the Soviet Union to decide what it is going to do to its own system. But we believe that our countries have much in common.

In the first place, we are northern neighbors. The USSR is the biggest country in the world. We both have enormous territories. Problems of transport, development of natural resources, telecommunications, delivery of goods to the market, agriculture—Canada has inevitably acquired vast experience in these spheres. And Canada can also be of assistance in these areas. As you know, in Canada the state has played a key role in developing the infrastructure and we are accustomed to the dynamics of a mixed economy. And our experience, the experience of a country whose economy is one of the strongest in the world despite having a small population—could be useful. We are not looking for any political benefits and we do not intend to convert anyone to our political philosophy, to our faith. I do that at home, in Canada. With variable success, though (he laughs)...

[Shalnev] It can be assumed that the talks in Moscow are bound to consider the upcoming Soviet-U.S summit off Malta. What do you expect the meeting to achieve and what should be its tasks, aims, and results, in your view?

[Mulroney] Some months ago, at George Bush's family home in Kennebunkport, I had a 4-hour meeing with him during which we were alone together. I told President Bush that he ought to have the same kind of conversation with President Gorbachev. So they could get to know one another much better, so they could talk about their problems and about how the United States and the Soviet Union can find points of contact and common ground.

[Shalnev] In your view, it could then be seen as a useful and productive meeting?

[Multoney] I think so. I do not expect any historic breakthroughs. And I think it would be a mistake to think that there should be breakthroughs. Who knows, perhaps they will reach understandings on particular issues. But this is not the main aim, it seems to me. The upcoming meeting gives the two leaders an opportunity to size one another up, assess one another, assess the situation, and try to establish how they can help one another. After all, they are the leaders of East and West. And it is extremely important that they should understand one another clearly and, in particular, that they should have a clear picture of how they can help one another, moreover without aggravating one another's problems. I have in mind a situation where someone—hypothetically speaking—creates more problems while trying to help solve them... What they need to do, really, is talk. President Bush is the kind of person who is not too keen on official meetings, he feels far better meeting one on one. He has a splendid grasp of the issues that will be discussed, he is familiar with all the details, and he certainly does not need to be always surrounded by dozens of aides. The same can be said of President Gorbachev. He is totally au fait with the situation. Gorbachev and Bush are acquainted with one another. But they have not yet met as state leaders, and now they have that unique opportunity.

[Shalnev] That is to say, Mr Prime Minister, you would not have any specific advice to give to either leader before the December meeting?

[Mulroney] I have something to say to them. And I will say it. But not to you. Otherwise there would be no point... Bush and Gorbachev face a big test and they can achieve great things. It is a time of unique opportunities. What the United States and the Soviet Union do in relation to one another and together is of vital important to everyone in the world. There must be no misunderstanding between them, all the nuances must be clear, and they have to talk with one another with the utmost clarity—about what divides them and about what can bring them closer together. It is not every day that we see what we are seeing today—I am talking about the events in Eastern Europe. There are two ways the United States and the West can look at the events there: You can make triumphant speeches or you can take a more restrained view of events, consider what is happening there as an important event that must be encouraged but from which you should not derive any particular benefit. It is important, very important that the Soviet Union should know that President Bush has resisted the very powerful appeals from the U.S. Congress to go to Berlin and do something that might offend the Soviet Union.

[Shalnev] You mean triumphant speeches, possibly?

[Mulroney] You would not hear them from anyone with any brains. It is acknowledged in the Western alliance that historic changes are taking place all over the world at the moment. These changes must be encouraged, but they should not be exploited.

[Shalnev] What do you mean by encouragement, when you are talking not only about words, but also about actions?

[Mulroney] The "big seven" countries want the reforms started by Mr Gorbachev to succeed—I do not know of any leader of the "seven" who thinks otherwise. Mr Gorbachev is seeking to create a more liberal society, he is seeking to reduce tension, and he aims to reduce armaments. It is the work of a great reformer. And we should react accordingly to this work. Which is what is happening, in fact. The industrially-developed countries have plenty of investment capital and technology and they must share them. Not to gain an advantage. Share them, if the Soviet Union is interested. The Soviet Union could decide at some time in the future that there is a limit to this interest. Well, that's fine. Canada has no interest at all in recommending its own system as the great model. The system serves us fine. We are happy. It enables us to have the second highest per capita income in the world. But we are not trying to impose it on others. There may be something of interest to the Soviet Union. Maybe not. But that is for the Soviet Union itself to decide.

[Shalnev] You will also be talking about arms control when you are in Moscow. What is your program in this sphere? I would particularly like to know your opinion of M.S. Gorbachev's Murmansk proposals.

[Mulroney] In the past 2 years great progress has been made in the arms control sphere. One reason for this is the fact that the West has been solid, that is has spoken with one voice. This is important for the West. But it is also important for President Gorbachev to know that he is dealing with one interlocutor, not with 16. Canada resolutely supports the position that gave us this success. I mean the collective success—of East and West. On a bilateral basis I would like to hear Mr Gorbachev's opinion on the whole range of issues; but anything connected with arms control should be a matter for the North Atlantic alliance in my view. The Arctic is your backyard, and ours, too. We have a fundamental interest there. As you have, too. That is why I will be discussing this with President Gorbachev in detail. It is, of course, a topic for bilateral debate. But any agreement in the arms control sphere, as you know, is concluded with NATO, while the USSR acts on behalf of its allies.

[Shalnev] Canada has extensive experience of tackling the nationalities question and, clearly, there are many elements of this experience that may be of use to us in the Soviet Union.

[Mulroney] One of the problems federations like ours and yours encounter is the fact that people living in outlying districts get the impression that Moscow or Ottawa has forgotten about them. The leader must bring the people together... I want to give you an example: The treaty on free trade between Canada and the United States is a treaty whose conclusion was entirely a federal matter. But the content of the treaty also affects provincial jurisdiction. As far as I remember, I had a total of 30 rounds of meetings with the provincial premiers during the process of elaborating the free trade treaty... I sympathize with President Gorbachev's efforts to bring people together.

[Shalnev] Mr Prime Minister, you will be bringing to Moscow invitations to M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov to visit Canada. When will the visits take place?

[Mulroney] Soon, I think. Mr Gorbachev was in Canada in 1983 and he made a big and very favorable impression here. I want him to come again. I want him to address the Canadian parliament and explain the problems he is encountering and the opportunities he sees both for the Soviet Union and for Canada.

[Shalnev] A personal question. They say, Mr Prime Minister, that when the Aleksandrov ensemble was in Ottawa recently, you sang "Kalinka" with them.

[Mulroney] Indeed. I arrived at parliament, where I was due to answer members' questions. And suddenly they tell me: Mr Prime Minister, the Soviet Army choir is here. Apparently they had been invited to see how parliament works. I saw them actually standing there in the corridor. I went up to them, greeted them, and said: You are very quiet for a choir. Let's have a song. So we sang.

[Shalnev] In Russian?

[Mulroney] Yes. I only sang a few bars, though. There we were, standing in the corridor of the House of Commons, singing.

[Shalnev] And are you going to perform something in Moscow?

[Mulroney] I remember President Gorbachev singing in the White House. With Reagan. So I would... Canadians know I like to sing. I expect there will be a musical interlude in Moscow.

[Shalnev] Finally, is there a question you think I should have asked you, but did not, one that you consider very important?

[Mulroney] I don't think so... It is widely believed in Canada that President Gorbachev and his colleagues are leading the process of changing the course of history in a very constructive and very advantageous direction. We want to contribute to that process. And we see the upcoming visit to the Soviet Union as a chance to confirm our support.

Canada is not a superpower. We know exactly who we are. We have always been independent. We have had a pretty fortunate history; we have created a country where people are tolerant toward one another, a country that is extremely successful economically. I think that there are certainly things we have done that will interest Mr Gorbachev. He may be interested in the way we have united the country... Cooperation has always been an instrument of mutual assistance. We want to learn from the Soviet Union and we hope that the USSR will be interested in our views. We are acting on that basis.

[Shalnev] Thank you, Mr Prime Minister.

Dinner Speech at Kremlin

PM2311092189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by Canadian Premier B. Mulroney at 20 November Kremlin dinner in his honor under the general heading: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] It was a very moving moment for me when I laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier today. I was struck by the simplicity of the memorial and by how well it reflects the nobility of the sacrifice made by so many young men and women, soldiers of the Soviet Army, during the Great Patriotic War. Just 10 days ago in Ottawa I laid a wreath at the Canadian national memorial to the soldiers who died at the front in the world wars as a sign of tribute to the sacrifice made by many thousands of young Canadian men and women in that and other wars. We lay wreaths and each time we solemnly swear not to forget those sacrifices, we solemnly promise never to let this happen again and to do everything to build a better world for future generations. The improvement of East-West relations gives us an opportunity to keep those solemn oaths. In the last world war Canada and the USSR were allies struggling against a common foe. We must never forget that either.

The appearance of a new generation of leaders in the Soviet Union inspires us with new hope and creates new opportunities in international affairs. It may also serve as the basis for a new beginning in relations between Canada and the Soviet Union. I am deeply convinced that the whole world has a vital interest in the success of your reforms. Few are given the opportunity to alter the course of history. And even fewer succeed. The activity of USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Gorbachev, however, is making an indelible mark on the course of world events. The scale and significance of the changes launched in the Soviet Union are such that Mr Gorbachev may confidently be regarded as one of the true reformers of modern history. There is a saying: "A people bereft of the gift of sight are doomed to destruction." I think that USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Gorbachev, Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov, and their colleagues are exercising bold leadership based on a clear vision of the future.

The program of internal political reforms put forward by the Soviet leaders as well as their clear confirmation of the right of all peoples to choose their own path of development free from outside interference, a confirmation which accords with the commitments adopted at the CSCE, have led to the easing of East-West tension. And, finally, with Mr Gorbachev's support an astonishingly rapid process of reforms has begun in Eastern Europe. In Poland and Hungary new governments have come to power after free elections. A process of creating new institutions for a new era is in progress there. Bulgaria is now embarking on that path, too. We are witnessing striking changes in Europe which were unimaginable just a few months ago. Gone are the barriers which divided people for decades, among them the Berlin Wall, that symbol of fear, ossification, and "old thinking." The wall which until recently divided people and set them against each other now symbolizes an era of hopes and new opportunities. And all this has happened with a speed which has confounded the predictions of most experts and instilled faith in people of good will throughout the world. There can be no losers with such a development of events: Both sides gain from such reforms.

But any reforms—and Soviet leaders know this as well as anyone—are often linked with disheartening difficulties and agonizing doubts. It is extremely difficult to deal with political problems which are the consequence of rapidly growing expectations. All countries at some period in their history have had to face the need to find ways to satisfy the demands and expectations of men and women striving to ensure a better life for themselves and their children. We in the West will not try to take advantage of that fact to undermine anyone's security. That would be contrary to our own interests because in the nuclear age it makes no sense to talk about security for one side alone.

In essence this is the first time since the war that true peace has become a real possibility. Whereas in the past the impression was created here in the West that Soviet foreign policy was pursuing aims dissimilar to ours, now we believe that under the leadership of Chairman Gorbachev, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and their colleagues it is increasingly recognizing the common nature of our most vital interests. The essential conditions of true peace are the reduction of conventional arms and short-range nuclear weapons in Europe, the removal of the imbalance in arms levels, and the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons by both sides to a minimum level which meets basic security requirements. Thanks to the goodwill which, it seems to us, may be observed among the political leaders of both sides, these problems are being successfully resolved.

As its contribution to the process of strengthening confidence, Canada will convene a conference on questions of "open skies" in Ottawa next year. During that conference the official representatives of 23 countries from East and West will discuss the details of an agreement under which each of them may, at short notice, make observation flights over the territory of the other countries. To ensure international security it is not enough just to agree, as we have done till now, that war should be avoided: For that it is also necessary that all countries realize the advantages of peace. I shall cite two very important advantages: The considerable reduction in arms spending made possible thanks to the increase in trust between East and West, and the corresponding easing of the burden on the two sides' economies. The universal recognition of these advantages offers the prospect of a new international order in which the sides' first line of defense would consist not of guns but ideas, in which open rivalry will occur only in the economic sphere and the human spirit will be freed and will be able to realize the aspirations of people throughout the world in all their simplicity and nobility.

The old postwar order is disintegrating and is being replaced by a new political structure which embraces Europe, both East and West. We welcome closer and broader commercial links between the EC and the countries of Eastern Europe, headed by the USSR. In a more closely united Europe with its advanced science and technology the conditions will arise for even greater economic growth and an even higher level of social justice for all Europeans, wherever they may live.

In a letter to the participants in the meeting in Paris in July, Mr Gorbachev raised the question of closer integration between the USSR and the world economy. Canada welcomed that initiative and noted the importance of the idea of the global interdependence of all countries.

We support the Soviet Union's participation in the system of international trade and payments, which is expanding as perestroyka creates the conditions for its success. We support, for instance, closer cooperation between the USSR and the OECD. Canada also thinks it necessary to examine the possibility of giving the USSR observer status at GATT conferences with the subsequent establishment of organizational ties with the participants of that conference. We in the West have gained an extraordinary amount from the close economic cooperation which resulted from the meeting of heads of government of the G7 countries. I intent to propose to my colleagues from the other G7 countries that each year before the the chairman of the economic conferences of those countries' leaders leaves his post he should be empowered to discuss the ideas and policy formulated during those conferences with the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The exchange of plans and ideas at the highest level could be of great economic benefit both to the Soviet Union and the West.

In our age of interdependence there can be no place either for barriers between East and West or for the gulf between North and South. What there can be, however, is a new world which we will all build together. Interdependence involves us in the prosperity of other countries and assigns us an important role in their dreams and plans. It also makes us share their burdens and concerns. Indebtedness, economic competition, drug addiction and drug trafficking, and the deteriorating state of the environment—these problems are well known to virtually all countries. Problems of an international character such as, for example, the change in the climate, the depletion of the ozone layer, deforestation, the depletion of fish stocks, acid rain, and the protection of the natural environment of the Arctic can only be resolved by means of a sensible policy within one's own country and effective cooperation in the international arena.

Glasnost and perestroyka, which opened the door to East-West cooperation, also improved the climate for bilateral cooperation between Canada and the Soviet Union. It is 18 years—an unforgivably long time—since the heads of our governments exchanged official visits. And this despite the fact that Canada and the Soviet Union are northern neighbors and natural partners in many respects. Like the USSR, Canada is a northern country occupying a vast territory with sharp climatic contrasts and an abundance of natural resources. If one were to say which country in the world most resembles the Soviet Union geographically, it would undoubtedly be Canada. Like you, we have to use a colossal amount of energy on heating our homes and providing our population with transport. Like you, we have to supply electricity over very great distances. We have had to create agricultural management systems designed for a comparatively short growing season. We have had to create a vast transport and communications infrastructure to form our country into an integrated unit. Canada is also a highly industrialized and technically advanced country, eighth among the economically developed states and one of the world's leaders in economic competitiveness in the international market. We have to cope with problems similar to those which you, too, encounter, and we, too, have experience in resolving problems which is applicable to your own conditions in these same areas. Nevertheless, leaving aside the flourishing grain trade and the rivalry in ice hockey, our relations have not been developing quite as we would have liked. Now, however, we can note the existence not only of substantial changes but also of considerable progress.

During this visit we are going to sign intergovernmental agreements on a wide range of questions on the international agenda. Agreements have been signed on expanding cooperation in the Arctic, on environmental protection, on the protection of capital investments, on the struggle against drug trafficking, on cultural ties, on cooperation in the space research sphere, on cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy and exchanges in the defense sphere, and all these agreements are within the framework of the political declaration that we have prepared which for the first time states our common understanding of world problems and lays down general principles for the implementation of bilateral cooperation.

It is equally important to note that 200 leading representatives of Canada's business circles have come with me to Moscow to meet with their Soviet counterparts. Their arrival in Moscow is the most concrete evidence of the favorable consequences of the reforms. They are going to discuss a large number of individual agreements, some of which will be signed in the next few days, on the creation of joint ventures worth more than $1 billion. These ventures will make it possible to introduce new technologies and specializations into Soviet industry and will offer new opportunities for economic development and employment in the Soviet Union. All this has become possible thanks to the changes now taking place in your country—the perestroyka of the economy, political transformations and the revision of certain provisions of the constitution aimed at improvements in the human rights sphere, the reorientation of foreign policy, and interest in participation in the international economy.

We are confident now that the USSR and Canada can establish new political and economic relations between themselves, relations which will benefit both sides. Relations in which general economic interests will reinforce each side's commitment to the preservation of peace. Relations which will enable the two sides to keep the solemn promises that they made before the memorials to the victims of the world wars—promises to build a better, more successful, and safer world for future generations.

Meeting With Ukrainian Leaders

LD2411023189 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Kiev November 23 TASS—By TASS correspondents Alexey Petrunya and Alexey Trotsenko:

"Brian Mulroney on behalf of the Canadian people," these words are inscribed on the red ribbon of the wreath that the Canadian prime minister placed today at the unknown soldier's tomb in the Glory Park in the Ukrainian capital. Eternal fire is burning on a hill over the Dnieper in memory of many millions of Soviet people who lost their lives during the Second World War.

On the same day Mulroney had meetings with first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party Vladimir Ivashko and with chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers Vitaliy Masol.

Long-standing ties between the Ukraine and Canada were noted during the conversations. About a million of

Canadian citizens are of the Ukrainian descent, and the centenary of the first Ukrainian settlement in Canada will be observed in 1991.

Both sides noted the importance of the development of the Ukrainian-Canadian ties in the commercial, economic, scientific, technological and cultural areas.

Ivashko emphasised that the Ukraine will take an active part in the implementation of the Soviet-Canadian agreement on cooperation between union republics of the USSR and Canadian provinces.

Ivashko told the guest about perestroyka in the Ukraine, about measures aimed at the improvement of the economy, and meeting social, economic and cultural requirements of the population.

Masol emphasised the importance of the development of cooperation with Canadian businessmen in re-equipping the processing and the light industries of the Ukraine and its agrarian sector.

Mulroney noted that new steps towards the consolidation of mutually advantageous ties were taken during his stay in the USSR. Joint ventures were created also in the Ukraine. The opening of the Canadian consulate-general in the Ukraine will help deepen versatile contacts. An agreement to open the consulate-general has been reached.

The Canadian prime minister today placed flowers at the monument to Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet and thinker. He said that Ukrainians in Canada treasure the memory of one of the Ukraine's great sons.

A news conference was held at the conclusion of the second day of Mulroney's stay in the Ukraine. He told the news conference that Canada supports reforms in the USSR and tries to find the ways to promote them.

Possibilities for Trade Assessed

LD2011115389 Moscow TASS in English 1113 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—By TASS commentator Andrey Orlov:

A 80-storey skyscraper which the Canadian Olympic and York Company intends to build in downtown Moscow and a whole world-trade-centre township which a consortium of Canadian firms offers to establish near Leningrad could become impressive symbols of a new stage of economic contacts between the Soviet Union and Canada.

These and many other business cooperation projects are expected to be the focus of attention during Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's visit to the Soviet Union starting today.

A party of 300 Canadian businessmen will accompany the Canadian prime minister on his trip to Moscow.

One would like to expect that we are on the threshold of serious shifts in Soviet-Canadian economic relations. So far the state of these relations suggested the idea of lost opportunities rather than being of gratifying nature.

Trade deals, with the exception of deliveries of Canadian grain, are of sporadic nature, rather. The number of Canadian firms' offices in Moscow can be counted on a pair of hands. The number of Soviet-Canadian joint ventures is also small.

Explaining the cause of such state of business contacts with the USSR, our northern neighbour's spokesmen often say that geographic, climatic and geological conditions of our two countries resemble each other to such an extent that trade between them loses the main common denominator—a mutually complementary character.

But I think that the point is in something else. Canada's approach to trade contacts with the Soviet Union, unlike that of Italy and the Federal Reopublic of Germany, has been politicised to such an extent that Ottawa at times turns out to be a sort of overzealous in abiding by various kinds of trade restrictions and often outperforms its southern neighbour in this respect.

Naturally, Canadian businessmen, lacking confidence in the government's favour, approach trade with the Soviet Union rather cautiously.

It seems, most western countries are now coming to regard in earnest the good changes now taking place in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

A new mechanism which is now being established for East-West trade and economic relations has an immense potential. Those who will realise this earlier than others, and Canada hopefully will be among them, will derive the greatest benefit from utilising it.

USSR-Canadian Business Roundtable

LD2111173689 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Orlov:

If perestroika is a success, the Soviet Union could be Canada's second biggest trading partner after the United States. This is the opinion of many Canadian businessmen participating in the bilateral roundtable on business cooperation currently in progress here.

Businessmen are accompanying Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney on his official visit to the USSR.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Yuriy Chumakov called on Canadians to increase their purchase of Soviet goods. He noted that there has been a great deficit in Soviet trade with Canada over the past few years.

The Soviet Union cannot always subsidise the import of Canadian grain from its positive balance of trade with other regions, for instance with Western Europe.

He welcomed the establishment of the Soviet-Canadian Business Council, a non-government body which aims to look for new ways to develop bilateral economic cooperation.

Meeting participants noted that out of the 1,101 joint ventures between the Soviet Union and foreign partners, only 26 are with Canada.

Forum participants said that an agreement on the mutual protection of investments, signed during Mulroney's visit, should create adequate guarantees for increased Canadian investments in the USSR. Soviet participants described changes in the Soviet economy. Yuriy Poletayev, board deputy chairman of the USSR Vneshekonombank noted that the rouble's convertibility is acquiring increasing urgency.

A plan is being drafted for a stage-by-stage transition to a convertible rouble. The process will begin with domestic convertibility for state-run enterprises, then for cooperatives and joint ventures, later for foreign partners and, finally, full convertibility.

Professor Mark Boguslavskiy described bills being drafted in the USSR. This is above all the bill on ownership with a section on property of joint ventures and the new control of export and import.

He also mentioned joint stock legislation which permits the establishment of joint stock societies and companies with limited liability in the USSR and grants new powers to territorial authorities in foreign economic activities.

When they are adopted, the USSR will be more appealing as a trade partner, Boguslavskiy concluded.

Polar Research Cooperation Prospects

LD2411152589 Moscow TASS in English 1247 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Leningrad November 24 TASS—The mathematical models of natural processes in the Arctic, now jointly elaborated by Soviet and Canadian experts, are regarded by Professor Boris Krutskikh as the "key to long-term global weather forecasts".

The monitoring service, keeping watch over natural and anthropogenic changes in the atmosphere and in the ocean, was up under the existing bilateral agreement. It is based on data regularly furnished by dozens of ground polar stations and observatories, by oceanographic ships and flying laboratories, and by Soviet drifting scientific stations.

Professor Krutskikh heads the Leningrad Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute, the main Soviet polar research centre. It annually organises expeditions to both polar caps of our planet and studies phenomena ranging from the sea bottom to the topmost layers of the atmosphere. Soviet scientists collaborate actively with foreign colleagues, including the Canadian research centres which play a major role in this cooperation.

"The Arctic and Antarctic institute has worked out jointly with the Toronto climatic centre a method to record the dynamics of atmospheric processes, the content of aerosols and industrial pollutions in the atmosphere", Boris Krutskikh said.

"The regular exchange of urgent scientific information and summary documents has been organised. These aspects of cooperation are illustrated by the exhibition at the Leningrad institute. Prime Minister Brian Mulroney of Canada, now paying an official visit to the Soviet Union, is expected to visit it today. Canadian scientists have also arranged there an exhibition of their polar achievements."

Speaking highly of the prospects of Soviet-Canadian Arctic cooperation, Professor Krutskikh stresses that they are developing "in a particularly favourable atmosphere of decreasing military confrontation and the triumph of a new mode of thinking that gives priority to universal human values."

The Soviet scientists said that an agreement to set up a joint enterprise to manufacture oceanographic research equipment on the basis of his institute and the Canadian Intera firm was expected to be signed shortly. It will draw on advanced Soviet scientific ideas and up-to-date Canadian technology. The equipment is intended for Soviet and Canadian research ships and will be offered for sale to third countries.

China

Heilongjiang Delegation Visits USSR

Arrival in Moscow 23 Nov

OW2811033589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] We have reported that a delegation from Heilongjiang, led by Shao Qihui, governor of the Heilongjiang Provincial People's Government, is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Government [RSFSR]. The Chinese guests arrived in Moscow on Thursday. Our station reporter (Chimitliyev) reported that the Chinese guests arrived in Moscow from Khabarovsk. Before flying to Moscow, the Chinese guests visited some Siberian cities in the Soviet Far East and held talks with local leaders. During the talks, they presented proposals for expanding cooperation.

Vlasov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Minister; Vinogradov, minister of foreign affairs of the RSFSR; and other officials welcomed Comrade Shao Qihui and other members of his party at the (Fulukaowo) airport. A few minutes before the arrival of the Chinese guests, our reporter had a brief interview with Comrade Vlasov.

He said: Notable progress has been made in Soviet-Chinese relations since Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China. The expansion of ties between the RSFSR and neighboring Chinese provinces also reconfirms this point. Although ties have existed in the past, they have reached a new level. I want to point out that we have begun mutually beneficial work. We have signed many cooperation agreements with China's three northeastern provinces. We think this is just the beginning. Comrade Shao Qijui's visit to the RSFSR is a continuation of this process. We welcome his visit and hope that the upcoming talks in Moscow will lead to the signing of an important cooperation agreement between the RSFSR and Heilongjiang Province for the next (?2 years).

After a warm, friendly welcome at the the airport, Comrade Shao Qihui said in an interview: We have come for a visit to the RSFSR at the invitation of Chairman Vlasov. As you know, this is the first high-level official visit between Heilongjiang, a very large province of China, and the Soviet Union's biggest federal republic. We arrived in the Far East region of the RSFSR on 11 November. We visited Khabarovsk, Nakhodka, and Vladivostok, and stopped over in Irkutsk before arriving in New Siberia. During out visits, we got the feeling that not only are conditions ripe for cooperation between Heilongjiang Province and the RSFSR, but friendly sentiments exist between their peoples. All these facts have strengthened our confidence in this visit. We are looking forward to holding official talks with Chairman Vlasov and other leading comrades of the RSFSR. We believe our visit and the upcoming talks will yield positive results. We are confident of the development of friendly relations between Heilongjiang and the RSFSR.

Visits Leningrad

OW2811045389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Report by station reporter Dmitriyev from Leningrad]

[Text] Dear listeners, as we have already reported, a Heilongjiang provincial delegation led by Governor Shao Qihui has been paying a goodwill visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Government. After staying in Moscow for 2 days, the delegation departed for Leningrad. Prior to this, the Chinese visitors had visited a few Soviet cities in the Far East and Siberia. Following is a report by station reporter Dmitriyev from Leningrad:

Next to Moscow, Leningrad is the second largest political, economic, and cultural center of the RSFSR, as well as of the Soviet Union. The revolution, which broke out in the then capital of czarist Russia, St Petersburg, has opened up the road to socialism for mankind. Showing an interest in the Great October Socialist Revolution and in everything related to Lenin, founder of the first socialist country in the world, the Chinese delegation visited Smolnyy Institute, from where Lenin led the October Revolution. The delegation laid a wreath on the Lenin Monument, and viewed Lenin's office and residence inside the palace. Heilongjiang Provincial Governor Shao Qihui wrote a few words in the guest book, saying: The October Revolution brought Marxism-Leninism to China and motivated the Chinese laboring people to plunge into the struggle for a bright future. The ideas of the October Revolution will continue to guide the Chinese people in carrying out socialist construction and strengthening friendship with the great Soviet people.

On the same day, the Heilongjiang provincial delegation met with (Zhupukov), first deputy chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet and a deputy from Leningrad Oblast. He briefed the Chinese visitors about the political, social, and economic reforms taking place in the city and oblast, as well as plans to further improve the living standards of the people of Leningrad and to minimize difficulties in the course of reforms, as well as the new workstyle of the party and soviet organs in the process of democratization in Soviet social life.

During the meeting, the two sides devoted particular attention to further developing comprehensive cooperation between Heilongjiang Province and various localities in the RSFSR. They pointed out that so far, the trade volume and contracts to be fulfilled with the RSFSR this year will amount to 1.2 billion Swiss francs. Although trade with Leningrad City and Oblast constitutes only a small portion of this figure, potential for bilateral trade is great. The Chinese showed an interest in having experts from Leningrad take part in the transformation of Heilongjiang's heavy industry and construction of pulp and paper-making factories. The Leningrad group also indicated an interest in learning from China's experience in absorbing foreign capital and setting up free economic zones in the Soviet Union.

Comrade Shao Qihui made a number of concrete proposals on cooperation to the Leningrad City Soviet, and invited the Leningrad group to visit Heilongjiang as part of effort to expand bilateral friendly ties. The invitation was accepted.

The meeting took place in a friendly atmosphere of mutual understanding. The Chinese visitors continued their tour of many of Leningrad's historical sites.

Border Disarmament Discussion Ends

OW2711160189 Beijing XINHUA in English 1531 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, November 27 (XINHUA)—A group of Sino-Soviet diplomatic and military experts ended their first round of negotiations here today.

The two sides agreed after their 15-day negotiation that mutual reduction of armed forces along the Sino-Soviet borders and the promotion of trust in the military field will be of significance in the development of their neighborly relations.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Ministers Victor Karpov and Igor Rogachev met the Chinese representatives on separate occasions. Chinese ambassador to Moscow, Yu Hongliang, was present at both meetings.

Officials from the Soviet Defense Ministry had a discussion with the representatives from the Chinese side.

The experts of both sides agreed to continue the negotiations in Beijing.

Officer Interviewed on Border Situation

OW2511075689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Announcer-read interview by unidentified station reporter with Major General (Gubenko), commander of the Transbaykal Military District—date, place not specified]

[Text] People often compare the border between two countries to a barometer which reflects instantly changes in bilateral relations. The Soviet - Chinese border is no exception. The barometer there is now indicating a clear and sunny day. The border atmosphere is now characterized by mutual trust and friendship. The following is a detailed account of this situation by Major General (Gubenko), commander of the Transbaykal Military District, in an interview with our station reporter:

[(Gubenko) is heard briefly in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] Since the beginning of the process to normalize Soviet - Chinese relations, the situation on the border has undergone a fundamental change. Tension has been dispelled completely, while coordination and cooperation between the border defense units of the two countries have produced more and more fruitful results. We are very satisfied with the outcome of the Soviet - Chinese summit last May. From my conversation with the relevant Chinese border defense officials, I understand that they share my feelings. They, too, are convinced that the normalization of Soviet - Chinese relations has opened up a new vista for cooperation between the border defense personnel of the two countries.

[Announcer] In order to promote multifacted exchanges between the two countries, what positive actions has the Soviet border defense organization undertaken?

[(Gubenko) is heard briefly in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] We have done everything within our capability to create the best conditions for promoting a vigorous growth of exchange between the two countries. For example, we recently built a number of new border entry and exist posts, which have considerably expanded the working capacity of the former border entry and exist posts. Entry and exit procedures for personnel and cargo have also been simplified. In order to further eliminate the red tape for obtaining necessary documents, we plan to negotiate with China for simultaneous completion of all border inspections. We have already presented a suggestion on this to the Chinese border defense organization.

[Announcer] What progress has been made in the contacts between the Soviet and Chinese border defense personnel?

[(Gubenko) is heard briefly in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] It should be pointed out, first and foremost, that we have long begun contacts with the Chinese border defense on a regular basis. Such contacts have mostly been meetings between representatives of the two countries to jointly solve problems related to the maintenance of order in the border areas. Meetings have always been held under a constructive atmosphere of mutual understanding. Of course, our contacts with the Chinese border defense personnel are not limited to such meetings. We have also met to solve certain concrete questions and have gathered on national holidays like friends. In conclusion, I am convinced that the contacts between our two countries will grow continuously.

USSR-PRC Ties Since May Summit Reviewed

OW2811084289 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Commentator Nikolayev commentary: "After Half a Year"; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] It has been a full 6 months since the Soviet-Chinese summit meeting was held. The meeting has become a historical event marking the complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. As you know, the road to normalization is by no means a smooth one. It requires both sides to show wisdom, act with a sense of responsibility, and display patience in overcoming the problems left over from the past. There is a Chinese saying: The road to happiness is strewn with setbacks. We have gained some experience in this regard through our joint efforts. The summit held last May not only ended the past, but also created political prerequisites for developing Soviet-Chinese cooperation in various fields.

A group of Soviet and Chinese diplomatic and military experts started their work in Moscow a few days ago. They discussed the issue of reducing the Armed Forces of both sides along the Soviet-Chinese border and of enhancing mutual trust in the military sphere. Such discussions are unusual, even under the circumstances of late, in which the two countries have taken in-depth and quick steps to develop their cooperation.

In fact, efforts have now begun to implement one of the agreements reached during Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China. Both Moscow and Beijing believe that they will be better able to understand and trust one another if the Soviet-Chinese border is demilitarized and turned into an area of peace and good-neighborliness. Efforts should be focused on peacefully creating labor and increasing resources to solve the complicated problems encountered in reforms launched by both countries. In the meantime, it should be noted that, despite the difference in the concrete work of carrying out reform in the Soviet Union and China, these reforms have the same purpose and are encountering similiar difficulties. Although the socialist revolutions in each country developed according to their respective domestic conditions, both sides increasingly desire to assimilate experience and draw lessons.

Exchanges of experience are linked closely to tapping great potentials in Soviet-Chinese economic cooperation. Let us examine what is taking place at the present in this regard. For example, the trade volume between the two countries is expected to reach a record 2 billion rubles this year. This, however, will by no means remain the record level. The agenda calls for developing bilateral trade and cooperation, starting with neighboring regions. The two sides have decided, following discussions, to reach agreement by the end of this year on long-term plans for bilateral cooperation in key economic, science, and technological fields up to the year 2000. With the Soviet Union beginning to use Chinese labor, a draft nongovernmental agreement in this regard will be worked out and perfected.

Meantwhile, Soviet-Chinese relations are developing in other fields as well. The two countries' parliaments have made important strides with regard to contacts and exchanges. Contacts between the communist youth leagues of the two countries have been normalized. The two friendship societies also have undertaken contacts and exchanges. Now that the Soviet Union and China are opening to each other to increase mutual understanding, contacts between their cultural and art workers are playing a significant role. Tourism in border regions also is developing well.

To sum up, we may point out that, on the basis of the results of the efforts exerted since the Soviet-Chinese summit 6 months ago, the agreements reached in Beijing can be said to have a substantive, practical content, which seeks to ensure stable development, an enhanced dialogue, a continued increase in mutual trust, and a commencement of concrete action to promote cooperation in new areas.

Northeast Asia

Reportage on Yakovlev's Visit to Japan

Interviewed by NOVOYE VREMYA

OW2611084189 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 24 Nov 89

["Summary" of NOVOYE VREMYA interview with Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and delegate to the Supreme Soviet who visited Japan "last week" as leader of the Supreme Soviet delegation; place of interview not given]

[Text] Politburo Member Yakovlev stated as follows:

Generally speaking, I have the impression that leaders of both political and business circles in Japan have the intention to improve Soviet-Japanese relations. As is known to all, all these people attach a ceretain condition to developing these relations. In any case, talks have been carried out in a practical way.

On the issue of concluding a peace treaty, Politburo Member Yakovlev stated that it was abnormal that this treaty had not been signed yet, and added as follows: According to the Japanese side's views, the conclusion of this treaty has been obstructed by the so-called unsettled territorial issue. I tried to persuade my opponents in a series of talks held in Japan. I stated that if it is impossible to mediate between two opposing views, a third course should be taken. In other words, we should take positive advantage of dialogues. That is how I tried to persuade my opponents.

As is known to all, dialogue has become an important measure in promoting discussions of major topics in the world during the past 4 years. And in promoting relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, it will be valuable to make use of extensive and constructive dialogues of our own accord. And the dialogues must be based on indisputable realities of the contemporary world. If we should want to attain a certain goal, we must make an overall study of every factor related to the issue. Through dialogues, we will be able to promote economic, political, and cultural relations at a high level. Then, we will be able to view even a most special problem from different viewpoints. This is what Politburo member Yakovlev has pointed out.

A reporter of the weekly magazine NOVOYE VREMYA asked Politburo member Yakovlev the following question: What do you think of the saying that it is the Soviet Union rather than Japan that is more interested in normalizing relations? In response, Politburo member Yakovlev stated the following:

Such a judgment is based not on realities but on illusion. We certainly want to promote our economic relations with Japan. Nevertheless, it is utterly a shortsighted view to hold that we cannot settle our own problems without someone else's aid. Of course, we can cooperate with companies of various nations other than Japan, and we intend to do so. However, it will be rather unnatural to develop Siberia and the Far East without Japan's participation. First of all, I think that in due course, the Japanese themselves will deeply regret that they have not made efforts to join in the development.

Then touching on the topic of Soviet threat, Politburo Member Yakovlev said that facts ares known to all, and added: If military threat should mean withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia, or talks with China on reducing military strength on Soviet-Chinese border areas, or proposals for reducing naval strength of both the Soviet Union and the United Stated in the Pacific Ocean, then I cannot understand what in the world will be the moves to reduce military danger. Perhaps, all the arguments aim at concealing Japan's program of developing military strength. We have made a proposal to the Japanese side for holding a special dialogue on disclosing the current situation of the armaments in this region.

The Japanese side expressed without exception at every session of talks during our visit to Japan that it is satisified with Mr Gorbachev's plan to visit Japan in 1991. It is apparent that Japan is waiting for and welcomes his visit and that his visit is apparaised as conforming to the interests of a majority of the Japanese people. Furthermore, it is believed in Japan that the Soviet leader's visit to Japan will bring about a new [words indistinct] to the relations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

Interviewed by Moscow Radio

OW2711150289 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Report on interview with Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and head of the Supreme Soviet delegation to Japan, by unidentified Radio Moscow reporter on 25 November; place not given]

[Text] A Radio Moscow reporter interviewed Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo, on 25 November. In this interview Politburo Member Yakovlev discussed the results of his recent visit to Japan. Politburo Member Yakovlev visited Japan as head of a Supreme Soviet delegation.

The Soviet leader, General Secretary Gorbachev, is scheduled to visit Japan in 1991. If Yakovlev's visit is viewed as preparation for Gorbachev's visit, what results were achieved? In reply to this question, Politburo Member Yakovlev said:

[Yakovlev heard briefly in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Since our delegation's visit was planned a long time ago, our visit is not directly connected with General Secretary Gorbachev's visit scheduled for 1991. However, objectively speaking, the delegation has made preparations for General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to Japan. Our visit was viewed by the Japanese side as preparatory. Naturally, we discussed several political issues as well as the history of Soviet-Japanese relations. We held talks so that nothing unexpected would be brought up during General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to Japan for summit talks. In this connection, our concern for the prospects of this future visit conform to those of the Japanese side.

Speaking of the outcome of our parliamentary delegation's visit to Japan, I feel that the outcome was not bad. The parliamentary delegation was not supposed to hold any official negotiations. However, the parliamentary delegation made efforts to lay the foundation for mutual understanding. In this respect, I feel that our delegation has succeeded to some extent. The Japanese side gave us a very hearty welcome, listened to us with caution, and treated us in a very friendly way. In fact, we were able to meet with all the people who hold leading positions in contemporary Japan. Among them are the emperor, political leaders, and parliamentarians. It goes without saying that we have some disagreements, particularly regarding views on the territorial issue.

Concerning this issue, no one in any quarter has ever expected that we would make any moves. Nevertheless, I tried to persuade the Japanese side not to confine itself to a certain [word indistinct] issues, but to take a wider view of Soviet-Japanese relations. I said that we should find a broader stage. In other words, we should discuss economic, political, and social issues. We will thus be able to view all other issues in a broader context. The Japanese side regards this as a third course. As is known to all, this third course has aroused great attention not only in the Soviet Union and Japan, but throughout the world. In other words, I feel that we must promote such dialogue with Japan. I think we can achieve some development in Soviet-Japanese relations on the basis of such dialogue. Personally, I am convinced that it is necessary to improve Soviet-Japanese relations, and that there are good prospects for such improvement.

In view of the nature of development of today's world situation, Japan and the Soviet Union have become very natural partners. When the degree of Japan's development and the underdeveloped situation in the eastern Soviet Union are taken into consideration, the efficiency of the cooperation between the partners will become all the more conspicuous. Of course, it will depend on the Japanese side's intentions. Needless to say, we wish for such cooperation.

This is what Politburo Member Yakovlev emphatically stated.

The Radio Moscow reporter asked the following question: Is there any possibility that an accord will be reached with Japan on the pending issues prior to the top leader's visit in 1991? For now, should we consider that the visit itself will probably give impetus to the settlement of these issues? In the past it was felt that the top leader's visit would be of significance only if an accord had been reached on pending issues prior to the actual visit.

[Yakovlev heard briefly in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Concerning current international relations, I don't feel that a series of concessions should be made either on this side or on the other side. Compromise [dakyo] does not equal concessions [joho]. In order to promote the development of the relations between such nations as the Soviet Union and Japan, I don't think we will achieve anything if we rely on the idea of setting preconditions. Both nations have self-respect, their own standing, and their own past and future. If dialogue is based on ultimatums—no matter whether serious and no matter how politely stated—no development can be expected in the relations between the two nations. It is necessary for the two nations to jointly seek a solution. Only then can we expect to achieve some results meeting the wishes of both sides in international relations. Of course, it is nonsensical for two such great nations to not have concluded a peace treaty in the 45 years since the war. Since there is no war right now and there will be no wars in the future, this certainly is paradoxical. It is necessary to conclude a treaty. I think the Japanese side also understands this point. We certainly are aware of it. I would like to state again and again that bilateral relations have already begun to make progress.

Results can be achieved only by actions, never from a stationary state. Only through actions can we correctly distinguish what is important from what is not important. While making actions, we can decide on the speed and nature of the moves and then predict the results. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, taking the position that we need to start advancing our relations now, I will never try to deal with each and every issue by setting preconditons. In the history of international relations, no one has ever gained from the use of preconditions.

This is what Politburo Member Yakovlev stated.

Pointing out that the Soviet side has repeatedly stated its readiness to hold dialogue without issuing an ultimatum, the Radio Moscow reporter asked if Yakovlev had noticed any signs that Japan is also ready to do so.

In reply, Politburo Member Yakovlev stated: There is no doubt that they want to develop relations with us. However, the Japanese side also has an official view. Those who want to promote relations with us cannot afford to neglect this official view. In this connection, we should try to seek the unknown factor [michisu] that can help us advance our relations. This is the task for the dialogue that I promote.

Visit, Japan Ties Reviewed

OW1911062389 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Announcer-read report by Moscow Radio Tokyo correspondent Potapov on the visit by a Supreme Soviet delegation to Japan led by CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member Yakovlev]

[Text] A Supreme Soviet delegation concluded its visit to Japan on 18 November. The delegation, led by CPSU Politburo Member Yakovlev, stayed in Japan for 1 week on an official visit. On 17 November the delegation members toured the Kansai region and returned to Tokyo to attend a banquet.

The visit by the Supreme Soviet delegation to Japan drew great attention in Japan. Japanese mass media reported the activities of the delegation in detail. Reporters gathered early in front of Hotel Teikoku where the delegation members stayed. Japanese observers listened eagerly to the activities of the delegation. For example, they paid attention to what impressions of Japan the delegation members had, what they think of the present situation and prospects for bilateral relations, and how they assess perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the series of changes in East Europe. All delegation members had a chance to state their opinion to Japanese mass media. For example, TOKYO SHIMBUN carried a detailed interview with Valeriy Boldin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee General Department, on 17 November.

Delegation head Yakovlev granted a television interview. Japanese newspapers carried Politburo member Yakovlev's views on the results of a series of meetings in Japan. According to the reports, Mr Yakovlev indicated that meetings were held in an atmosphere in which unusual attention was paid to the Soviet Union and ways for future development in bilateral relations were explored. He said: I found agreement on major points. The Soviet side and Japanese politicians support peaceful good-neighborliness.

Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman Watanabe, at a Friday news briefing, made the same assessment on the outcome of the visit, He said essentially what Mr Yakovlev stated in his remarks. Spokesman Watanabe also pointed out: Both sides agreed that with the international situation experiencing fundamental changes, the building of new relations between Japan and the Soviet Union has become necessary and important.

A Radio Moscow correspondent interviewed a representative of the Japan Socialist Party [JSP]. In the interview, JSP Vice Chairman Toshiharu Okata expressed his expections that the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to Japan would give a new impetus to future development in Soviet-Japanese relations. He added: At present, a working group formed on the basis of an agreement at foreign ministerial talks between the two countries is continuing to work for the conclusion of a peace treaty. I think the delegation is visiting Japan to examine problems involving General Secretary Gorbachev's planned visit to Japan and to clarify the two countries' approaches to conditions for his visit to Japan. The holding of a Soviet-Japanese summit meeting has taken on a more practical nature. Depending on the results of the summit, advances could be made in the major issue of easing tension in the Asia-Pacific region. In the interview, he also pointed to progress in exchanges between the two countries in the cultural and scientific fields and expressed his support for further active development in trade and economic cooperation between the two countries. However, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party is linking the trade and economic cooperation to resolution of the territorial issue. JSP Vice Chairman Okata agreed with Politburo member Yakovlev's view that to move away from the present state in Soviet-Japanese relations, there is no choice but to find a third way. It is necessary for the two countries to explore the third way togather.

'New Relations' With Japan Urged

OW2611080989 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Commentary by station commentator Ivanov]

[Text] A delegation of the Supreme Soviet, a body of supreme state power in the Soviet Union, visited Japan last week, the first time a delegation from that body has visited Japan. Another important factor was that the delegation was led by Yakovlev, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. He is one of the Soviet leaders and is widely known as the architect of perestroyka and new thinking in that country. It was under these circumstances that the delegation drew unprecedented attention in Japan. With the delegation's visit to Japan as a turning point, we hope that a recent forward-looking trend in Soviet-Japan relations will be further consolidated. The delegation's visit to Japan gave a new impetus to the preparations being made for Mr Gorbachev's visit to Japan seheduled for 1991. Will this hope be fulfilled? Mr Yakovlev's visit to Japan definitely confirmed the seriousness of both the Soviet Union and Japan to better bilateral relations. The present state of bilateral ties remains unsatisfactory compared with that existing between the Soviet Union and other Western nations. As Mr Yakovlev pointed out, relations between the Soviet Union and Japan lack broadness and stability, and are unpredicable.

People in the Soviet Union believe that it is now necessary to raise bilateral relations to a new level in view of the status and roles played by the Soviet Union and Japan in the world. Understanding of this thinking is growing among the Japanese people as well and was confirmed by the delegation. Mr Gorbachev's visit to Japan was a major topic of discussion at the meetings between delegation members and the Japanese side. The decision to announce Mr Gorbachev's visit to Japan 2 years before he is to undertake the trip is regarded as a rare diplomatic practice. Why was the decision made so early? The Japanese side repeatedly sought an answer to this. According to Yakovlev, the Soviet side has sought consistently to carry out this visit, unprecedented in the history of Soviet-Japan relations, at the earliest time. However, 1990 was inconvenient because the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the 28th CPSU Congress are scheduled to be held. It is for these reasons that it would be difficult for the Soviet leader to visit Japan next year. Thus, 1991 was chosen as the earliest time that such a visit could take place. I believe that this explanation substantiates the seriousness with which the Soviet side views a Soviet-Japan summit.

The Japanese side touched on the so-called territorial issue as anticipated. In a news conference, Mr Yakovlev asked the Japanese press corps to ask their second questions because he was well aware of the content of their first questions, which he had answered on numerous occasions. His request is significant in itself. Our vision has become blurred and impenetrable because we look at bilateral relations only through the prism of the first question, that is, the territorial issue. However, the two countries should develop their relations. Therefore, Mr Yakovlev pointed out that it is necessary to find a third way, stressing that this means exploring ways to broaden the dialogue and develop bilateral ties further. The Soviet Union and Japan should build new relations qualitatively different from what existed previously, which reminds us of the sad past and hostility. The new relations will be able to give rise to mutually different views and, at the same time, resolve perennial issues between the two countries. We hope the Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to Japan will be a step toward building these relations.

Japan's Kaifu Favors Friendly Relations

LD1911113789 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo November 19 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu stated today his readiness to promote the development of goodneighbourly relations with the Soviet Union.

Speaking at a news conference in Sapporo, Hokkaido Island, where he arrived to meet local public representatives, Kaifu said he would like to promote friendly relations between the two countries by broadening people-to-people contacts.

Japan's foreign policy course with regard to the Soviet Union is based on a desire for a settlement of the issue of "Northern Territories" and the conclusion of a bilateral peace treaty, Kaifu said.

These key principles remaining intact, it is desirable to promote friendly relations with the Soviet Union through realistic deeds, he said.

In answer to journalists' questions about the latest developments in Europe, Kaifu welcomed the fact that the East and West now prefer dialogue, not confrontation.

He voiced hope that the process of reforms taking place in socialist countries will contribute to the cause of peace and stability in the world.

Japan intends to cooperate with East European countries in most diverse fields, Kaifu said.

Shevardnadze Cited on Relations With ROK

SK2011022489 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met Soviet People's Deputies at the Kremlin on 17 November. Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze, speaking at this meeting, informed the deputies of the events at the Supreme Soviet meeting held on 23 October. [passage omitted]

Answering questions on the relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea, Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze noted that cooperation between the two countries was developing on a nongovernmental level. He said that although the Soviet Union does not impose any restrictions on the development of its economic relations with South Korea, they have been developing in a (?meager) manner so far. For instance, the trading of goods over the last (?1 year) period was no more than (?$300 million). The conditions for the establishment of diplomatic relations between South Korea and the Soviet Union are not ripe, he noted.

He went on to say that if South Korea (?takes steps) to save the Korean peninsula from nuclear weapons, a possibility for establishing diplomatic relations will open. He noted that the nuclear weapons deployed there are directed at the Soviet Union as a target. If South Korea truly desires strengthening its relations with the Soviet Union, it ought to give serious thought to this.

ROK Sovereignty, UN Membership Discussed

SK2811110689 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] The delegation of the Soviet Institute for World Economy and International Relations led by its Director, Vladlen Martynov, professor of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, visited the ROK [Hanguk] at the invitation of Kim Yong-sam, president of the opposition Reunification Democratic Party.

We will now carry for you the gist of the interview which professor Martynov had with Vitaliy Ignatenko, reporter of the Soviet magazine NEW TIMES, who accompanied him during the visit.

In the interview, Vitaliy Ignatenko said the Soviet Union had normally not described South Korea as a country or Seoul as a capital. He said he keenly felt this (?when he was visiting Seoul).

Yes. Such a delicate situation still remains, said Vladlen Martynov.

He said he thinks we should begin from acknowledging the objective reality when we regard the principle of new thinking as a guideline in foreign policy.

South Korea is a sovereign country in every aspect. Its existence is an objective reality, regardless of our desire.

There is the question of South Korea's UN membership. This question should be handled according to the UN Charter. Both the DPRK and the ROK have the right to raise the question of their UN membership.

In the interview with the NEW TIMES reporter, Vladlen Martynov said South Korea has no justification whatsoever for the U.S. military presence in South Korea. He said the U.S. troops came to Korea during the cold war when the military strategies and priorities, different from the current ones, were dominant and they are still there. Today, the White House should know that such an era is now over.

Concerning the future of the Soviet-ROK relations, Vladlen Martynov said that the future of the relations depends on (?cooperation). He said that what is most important is economic cooperation. He said that various agreements, such as investment guarantee agreements, are necessary. He asked how such agreements can be concluded when official ties are not established.

In conclusion, Vladlen Martynov said we should, above all, develop trade with the ROK. Developing trade will equally help our two countries. This is a reasonable way of developing the relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

ROK Purchase of New U.S. Fighters Criticized

SK2511080689 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Talk on article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA commentator (Aleksandr Kolz)]

[Text] According to reports from newspapers published in Seoul [passage indistinct]. In this connection (Aleksandr Kolz), commentator from the Soviet newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, writes as follows: Such a thing has nothing to do with [word indistinct]. It is related to military affairs. In selecting the type of fighter-bombers, the Seoul authorities have decided not to select U.S. F-18A type fighter-bombers, called Hornets, but to select U.S. F-16 type fighter-bombers, called Fighting Falcons.

It has been decided through negotiations between the war industrial organs of the two countries that South Korea is to purchase 12 U.S.-manufactured fighter-bombers and that 38 fighter-bombers are to be assemblied in South Korea with component parts delivered from the [word indistinct]. Along with this, 72 fighter-bombers will be directly manufactured in South Korean plants. This contract will be implemented in the later part of the 1990's. Why is South Korea, which already has a mighty air force power, attempting to introduce new fighters?

According to a report in the military magazine Jane's Defense Weekly, Seoul foresees the possibility of withdrawal of the U.S. forces stationed in the southern half of the peninsula [words indistinct]. This magazine reported that these new fighter-bombers, which will be introduced from the United States, will perform the mission that the two U.S. air squadrons stationed in South Korea, which are equipped with F-16 type fighters, are now performing.

The commentator from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA says that "I will, however, refrain from making such negative comments." [passage indistinct]

As a spokesman of the South Korean Government said: The decision to purchase F-16 type fighters was made because of the deployment of these [words indistinct] in the territory of the country. [passage indistinct]

The South Korean leadership has many military (?pilots). South Korea is attempting to purchase military helicopters and missile technology from [words indistinct]. It has already ordered a submarine from the Federal Republic of Germany. Along with this, its own war industry is being vigorously developed.

All of this is being implemented while ignoring the DPRK's realistic peace proposals to alleviate tension on the Korean peninsula.

Seoul should make its own choice in [words indistinct] regardless of whether it likes to do so or not.

The commentator from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA believes that such a choice is more important than the selection of the type of fighters, that is to say, F-16's or F-18's.

The new military contract concluded with the United States will become another obstacle in the path toward a positive resolution to the Korean peninsula problem.

CPSU Delegation Studies DPRK Party Cadre Work

PM2311160989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 22 Nov—In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Workers Party of Korea [WPK], a group of CPSU party workers headed by Yu.S. Karabasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of Moscow city party committee, was in the DPRK 13-21 November being acquainted with the party's experience in leading cadre training at higher educational establishments.

The delegation had meetings and conversations at party committees at a number of the country's educational establishments and enterprises, the WPK Central Committee, and the Pyongyang city party committee.

USSR-DPRK Journalists Conference Noted

SK1811080289 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Nov 89

["Brief News on Soviet-Korean Relations" from the "(?Road) of Friendship" program]

[Text] The editorial departments of KOMMUNIST, a magazine of the CPSU Central Committee, and KULLOJA, a magazine of the Workers' Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee, arranged a roundtable conference in Pyongyang on the party's leadership in socialist construction. Participants in the conference discussed ways to guarantee overall social conditions in the reform of all aspects of social life in the Soviet Union and in carrying out the socialist construction underway in the DPRK. Attention was focused on the issue of formulating social and economic strategies, the issue of cooperating among the fraternal parties for (?friendship), the issue of policies in the (?political) sector, and the issue of guaranteeing unity between the party and people.

The Soviet and Korean representatives exchanged experiences on party building and forms and methods of the party's activities. They stressed that the party's (?internal relations) must be developed based upon Leninist ideas and organizational principles that attach significance to the interests of people.

This roundtable conference was the second one between representatives of the editorial departments of KOMMUNIST and KULLOJA. Last year they met in Moscow, and discussed the issue of guaranteeing peace in Asia and the Pacific and the Korean reunification issue.

Various functions took place in the DPRK on the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. One of them was a Soviet book exhibition held in Hamhung, a big industrial center and a city of chemical industrial workers. Activists of the Korean-Soviet Friendship Society, workers of the city, and university students who are studying Russian saw, with interest, works on restructuring in the Soviet Union written by Soviet leaders, works by Russian and Soviet writers and poets, and political and scientific and technological books. Luxurious children's books, albums, and sculptures attracted the attention of the viewers at the exhibition.

A Soviet porcelain, craft work, and glass exhibition took place in Pyongyang. Works on display attracted attention due to their [word indistinct] and refined colors. The (Chondo) Craft Work and People's Arts Museum organized this exhibition. This exhibition, the first of its kind, was organized on the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. When opening this exhibition, Kim Chang-kuk, DPRK vice minister of culture and art, expressed his firm belief that it will attract great attention in [word indistinct] in Pyongyang and will made an important contribution to developing the Soviet-Korean relations in the cultural fields.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese Delegation Pays Official Visit 19 Nov

Arrival in Moscow 19 Nov

LD1911105489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov (TASS)—Today a delegation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam National Assembly headed by committee chairman Nguyen Thi Binh, arrived in Moscow on an official visit. The delegation was invited by the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee.

Studies Soviet Experience

PM2311144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Course of Renewal"]

[Text] The SRV's political course of renewal is akin to the Soviet perestroyka. This community of the two fraternal countries' aims and purposes was stressed by Nguyen Thi Binh, chairman of the SRV National Assembly Foreign Relations Commission, who is heading a Vietnamese parliamentary delegation. In a conversation at the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee 20 November she described the main directions in realizing the concept of renewal and the course of transformations in various economic spheres, highlighted the essence of the processes of democratizing Vietnamese society, and dwelt on questions of strengthening the principles of people's power.

The delegation showed great interest in the work of the new Soviet parliament and the practical activity of its committees and commissions. The parliamentarians expressed their ideas on ways to strengthen Soviet-Vietnamese economic ties and talked about new approaches to cooperation in this sphere.

Nguyen Thi Binh on Perestroyka

BK2711061789 Moscow International Service in Vietnamese 1000 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] A delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam National Assembly Foreign Relations Committee has concluded a 3-day visit to the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. The Vietnamese guests were received by and held talks with members of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan and the people's committee of Baku city. They also visited a number of enterprises.

The Vietnamese national assembly delegation was briefed on the Soviet working people's participation in the restructuring of the people's economy, on activities aimed at overcoming negative phenomena in the national economy, on issues of ideology and other social aspects, and on the training of Vietnamese oil engineers and other specialists at the Baku university.

Reviewing results of the delegation's visit to Azerbaijan, Nguyen Thi Binh, chairman of the SRV National Assembly Foreign Relations Committee and deputy head of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee Foreign Relations Department, highly appraised the experience on restructuring gained by the Vietnamese delegation during its visit to the USSR, saying this will help encourage the Vietnamese people in their initial steps toward renovating Vietnamese society. She said: Many issues being resolved in Azerbaijan are also pressing in Vietnam, especially for members of CPV.

Nguyen Thi Binh stressed: Strengthening friendship with the Soviet people and consolidating SRV-USSR all-round cooperation are essential factors ensuring achievements in all domains in Vietnam.

Trade, Payments Protocol Signed

PM2311105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Protocol Signed"]

[Text] A protocol on trade turnover and payments between the USSR and the SRV for 1990 was signed in Moscow 21 November as a result of talks which have ended.

The document provides for the delivery from Vietnam of natural rubber, coffee, tea, tropical fruits and vegetables, freshly frozen meat, and other foods, sewn and knitted articles, footwear, and various consumer goods.

Machinery and equipment and traditional raw material goods will be delivered to Vietnam from the Soviet Union.

Cooperation will be further developed within the framework of long-term targeted programs and direct links.

Gen Kochetov To Pay Visit to Vietnam, Laos

PM2711123589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Army General K.A. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister, will pay an official visit to the SRV and the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR] at the end of November-beginning of December this year at the invitation of SRV National Defense Minister Army General Le Duc Anh, and LPDR Defense Minister Army General K. Siphandon.

SRV Spokesman Deplores UN Cambodian Resolution

PM2311132189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS dispatch: "In the Old Mold]

[Text] Hanoi, 19 Nov—The resolution on Cambodia adopted at the 44th UN General Assembly session does not correspond to the realities or the need for a comprehensive solution of the Cambodian problem, an SRV Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement circulated here states.

Similar unconstructive resolutions adopted over the past 10 years, the statement says, not only hampered the settlement of the conflict but placed the United Nations outside this process. It is for this reason that practical efforts to solve the problem take place at the informal meetings in Jakarta and the international conference on Cambodia in Paris. At the same time the authors of the draft resolution—ASEAN countries and participants in the aforementioned forums—directly contradict the results of the Paris conference in the document. The resolution even denies the fact of the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia and reaffirms support for the Pol Pot grouping. This is happening at a time when all efforts should be concentrated on preventing the restoration of the genocidal Pol Pot regime and the unleashing of civil war in Cambodia.

Vietnam fully supports the just position of the State of Cambodia. The SRV Government expresses confidence that the only correct way to achieve a settlement is the strict observance by all countries of their commitments to end military aid to the Cambodian factions.

The United Nations, the Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, should play the role of a genuine champion of peace and expresser of the interests of all peoples in this process. This approach would facilitate the solution of the Cambodian problem and the transformation of Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Opposition Releases Two Soviet POW's

LD2711140489 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Peshawar November 27 TASS—Andrey Lopukh and Valeriy Prokopchuk, two Soviet servicemen held prisoner by Afghan rebels, have been turned over to the Soviet side at the headquarters of the "transitional government" of the Afghan armed opposition here.

The ceremony was attended by V. Yakunin, Soviet ambassador to Pakistan, acting president of the "transitional government" Seyyed Ahmad Gaylani, acting first deputy foreign minister of Pakistan Bashir Khan Babar, chief of the International Red Cross delegation in Pakistan Andre Collomb, a delegation of the public "Nadezhda" (hope) committee and the servicemen's mothers.

In the evening, the "Nadezhda" delegation, the mothers and Lopukh and Prokopchuk themselves will be received by Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto.

The Soviet delegation will fly to Moscow on November 28.

Further on Release

LD2811072989 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] Islamabad November 28 TASS—Two Soviet prisoners of war were turned over to the Soviet Embassy in Pakistan in an official ceremony held in Peshawar on Monday.

Having waited a long time, the Soviet servicemen's mothers, Maria Nikolayevna Lopukh and Valentina Afanasiyevna Prokopchuk, found themselves tightly embraced by their grown-up sons.

"Don't cry, mother, everything is over," Andrey Lopukh, close to tears, was heard whispering to his mother. The noise obscured what Valera Prokopchuk told his mother, but his steady gaze was more eloquent than words.

Even experienced journalists were touched.

The Peshawar ceremony was attended by Soviet Ambassador V. Yakunin, acting Pakistani First Deputy Foreign Minister Bashir Khan Babar, Afghan armed opposition leader Pir Sayed Ahmad Gaylani, head of an international red cross delegation in Pakistan Andre Collomb, and a delegation from the people's committee for the release of Soviet prisoners of war in Afghanistan—"Nadezhda" (hope).

"We are grateful to all who helped bring about this reunion, above all Afghan armed opposition leaders, the Pakistani Government and personally Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto," the Soviet ambassador said at the ceremony.

"We believe that this will be the beginning of the return of our men home," he said.

"In a few days' time the Afghan Government will make a reciprocal step of goodwill and release several mujahidin, citizens of other states and Pakistani citizens," he added.

Bashir Khan Babar said that Pakistan understood the concern of relatives of prisoners of war. "Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto is devoting unremitting attention to the prisoners of war problem and is seeking to step-up its solution," he said.

U.S. Role in Afghanistan Analyzed

LD2411041889 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—By TASS news analyst Askold Biryukov:

A decree by Afghan President Najibullah has been distributed in Kabul announcing the extension of the state of emergency in the country. Because of the need to protect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan, it said, the state of emergency will be extended by six months.

The reasons prompting this extraordinary measure are well known. Aggression against Afghanistan continues, as foreign countries continue to stake up the bloody fratricidal war.

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper recently reported that the United States and Saudi Arabia have agreed to allocate 715 million U.S. dollars in secret aid to the armed Afghan opposition. The aid will be carried out by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

According to the newspaper, these allocations will be used to purchase armaments and ammunition to be sent to Mujahedins over the next three months. The latest abortive offensive mounted by rebels against Jalalabad was preceded by a string of meetings between opposition leaders and American and Pakistani officials.

THE FRONTIER POST newspaper announced that the so-called Afghan Committee of the Pakistani Government, which lays down guidelines for Islamabad's policy vis-a-vis Afghanistan, held two meetings. The meetings were attended by top Pakistani politicians and military leaders, as well as by U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Robert Oakley and CIA Deputy Director Richard Kerr. There was also a meeting between the U.S. envoy to the Afghan opposition, Peter Tomsen, and rebel leaders. It is not hard to guess what issues were discussed at these meetings.

In his recent interview with the Iranian newspaper RESALA'AT, President Najibullah largely attributed the continuation of the bloodshed in Afghanistan to the influence on Mujahedins of several foreign states, especially the United States.

Washington does not seem to realise that relying on force, even on the most advanced weapons, cannot solve the Afghan conflict. This policy only results in the continuing murder of Afghans by Afghans, in increasing victims among the civilian population, and in growing damage to the Afghan economy, primarily its leading sector—agriculture.

Peace is the only way to settle the conflict. Long ago the Kabul Government put forward a programme of national reconciliation involving all interested political forces. The Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, which foresee the end of interference, intervention and all attempts to destabilise the situation in Afghanistan, aim to bring about exactly this solution. Ironically, the United States is one of the guarantors of the settlement agreements reached in Geneva.

Recent statements in Washington have stressed the need for Soviet-U.S. cooperation in untying the knots of regional conflicts worldwide. But what example does the American Administration set in this specific direction?

At one time Washington put forward the idea of "negative symmetry", the reciprocal rejection by the USSR and the USA of arms deliveries to warring Afghan sides. However, as soon as the Soviet Union agreed to cooperate with the United States on that issue and stated its readiness to realise that idea, Washington backed down from its proposal. Perhaps the U.S. was simply biding time, waiting to install the CIA-groomed opposition in power.

Today both the Soviet Union and the U.S. have real opportunities to untie the knots of regional conflicts that burden international relations. But both sides must participate.

Najibullah on Peace Talks, Relations

LD2411000689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2034 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Interview with Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan and general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, PDPA, Central Committee, for Soviet television by international affairs journalist Boris Pyadyshev; date, place of interview not given; Najibullah speaks in Dari with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Pyadyshev] History bears witness that under President Najibullah, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghan territory was completed on 15 February, 1989. Many people said that this would be the death sentence for the authorities, that the Kabul Government would not last a few weeks or even a few days. However, precisely 9 months have passed, and the Kabul regime not only has not fallen but is becoming increasingly firm. Please tell us the reasons and the sources of this viability and tenacity.

[Najibullah] Right from the start the predictions that the regime would fall within a few days or weeks were doomed to failure since they were not in accord with the real situation in our society. The basic reason for the regime's resistance was the existence of a strong political, economic, social, and military system, which we call the state of the Republic of Afghanistan, created over the past 10 years. This system enjoys the support of the people and has demonstrated an ability to administer the life of the country and defend national interests. It has rallied the people in the face of external interference. One more reason is that the people demonstrate a passionate wish to defend themselves independently in the face of foreign aggression in the east and southeast of the country, which began after the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Another factor is the humane policy of national reconciliation which forced many representatives of the armed opposition either to totally withdraw from the war or else, as a minimum, to give up their bellicose position. On the other hand, after the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops, there was clear evidence that the majority of opposition groupings were closely connected with foreign states. Yet another reason: The people need peace, the cessation of war, and national unity in the face of plots and intrigues by foreigners. This factor led to the creation of a broad strong front, which includes all patriotic forces and individuals.

During all of these processes, the PDPA which has a quarter of a century of political experience, and a quarter of a million patriots in its ranks, played the inspiring role. Just as the April Revolution triumphed under the leadership of this party, so in the years of aggression and interference from outside it showed its courage and capability of heading the Afghans' defensive struggle. After the withdrawal of Soviet troops, this party was able to stand in the front ranks of the defenders of the homeland and, having announced the policy of national reconciliation, it created the most favorable conditions to mobilize all patriots and all peaceloving forces for the restoration of peace.

[Pyadyshev] Now about the Afghan settlement. Some statesmen—and I was told about this by the minister of foreign affairs of one of the countries neighboring Afghanistan, in particular—assert that the idea of an international conference on Afghanistan is not realistic, as the leaders of the opposition groups don't want to sit down at the same negotiating table with you. Is this idea, which fully corresponds with the Geneva agreements, so unreal? And is it true that representatives and the leaders of the opposition groups don't have any discussions and any contacts with you—if not public, then private?

[Najibullah] As to the position of the Republic of Afghanistan, you know that it has always come out in favor of a political settlement of the Afghan issue. In connection with this, it developed its plan or peace program, together with the mechanism of its implementation. This program was presented at the Grand Assembly and it was heard from the rostrum at the conference of the nonaligned countries. This program also talked about conducting an international and regional conference on a political settlement of the Afghan problem. Some people allege that the opposition is not ready to sit down at the negotiating table with the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan and start a dialogue with it. I can openly say that the contacts and negotiations on different levels between us and the armed opposition are continuing, inside the country as well as outside it. Results have already been achieved in many areas. It is natural that the opposite side, following our ancient customs and traditions, asked us not to bring to light any names before reaching final results. We will be faithful to this principle, but the main thing is that such contacts and negotiations are continuing.

[Pyadyshev] The Soviet troops have left Afghanistan, but our lads who became captives remain behind. Our pain will not depart until they are released. Although we are grateful for the efforts you are making to reach agreement on the release of our lads from captivity, what could still be done, in addition, by you to lighten the lot of our lads, our prisoners of war?

[Najibullah] We have made great efforts in this area to involve various countries and governments, international political and public organizations, and individual figures in the release of the prisoners. We have repeatedly released opponents of ours from prison who had been sentenced to imprisonment for various crimes. A delegation led by Lord Bethell, chairman of the European Parliament's human rights sub-committee, was here recently on a goodwill mission. As a goodwill gesture, we unilaterally released several prisoners and handed them over to him, in order for him, in turn, to hand them over to the opposite side. That was also a gesture of goodwill on our part. We are prepared, as before, to intensify the negotiating process on the exchange of prisoners and on the release of Soviet prisoners of war. However, much depends here on the opposite side as well—on how far they are prepared to continue the negotiations, and to put forward sensible proposals of their own.

Be that as it may, we understand well the bitterness, pain, and anxiety of the families whose sons and brothers are being held hostage by the armed opposition. We feel our responsibility for their release from captivity, and we shall take all necessary measures to restore to Soviet families their dear, captive sons. We hope our work will be crowned with success.

[Pyadyshev] If you will permit, here is one last question. Eduard Amrosiyevich Shevardnadze has mentioned a telephone conversation which recently took place between you. The content of the conversation is surprising. Battles are still continuing, but you, the president of Afghanistan, have unfolded a whole program for the peaceful restoration of the Afghan economy and for the development of Soviet-Afghan relations, while not in the form of aid on the part of the Soviet Union to Afghanistan but on a mutually advantageous basis. Tell me please, in practical terms, how is implementation possible for these daring plans and ideas?

[Najibullah] For any country the question of its social and economic development is a vitally important matter. This particularly applies to countries which, like Afghanistan, have experienced the horrors of war in recent years, and which have had immense material and financial damage caused to their national economy. All people who bear responsibility for the destiny of the homeland, whatever post they occupy, should think about the social and economic development of their country. Even in wartime it is necessary to occupy oneself with these most important issues. Wars end, and the period of economic development in society is long.

As for the technical, economic, and cultural cooperation between our countries, it has a history dating back nearly a century, and it developed both during the times of Tsarist Russia and since the formation of the Soviet Union. Fortunately, these relations always corresponded to the national interests of our two countries. Bilateral technical and economic contacts have achieved the greatest development during the last 4 decades and have found reflection in the creation in Afghanistan of a number of installations of Afghan-Soviet cooperation. Indeed, they have proved to be of immense help in the social and economic development of our homeland.

Of course, the Soviet Union, as an industrially developed and civilized country, as our good neighbor, has always given assistance to Afghanistan, a developing country. I think that the rendering of assistance by developed countries to developing countries has become a moral principle, and simultaneously both sides, both the developed side and the developing country, proceeding from economic necessity, may—in the framework of bilateral cooperation—draw mutual benefit. Possibilities and a potential exist in Afghanistan that it is possible to use with advantage for both countries.

In the telephone conversation with Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, I mentioned certain specific possibilities and installations. Among them is the renewal of gas exports to the USSR, and the use of minerals from Afghanistan, including Barite. The opencast mines for this mineral are 43 km from the Soviet frontier, in the northwest of the country in the area of Herat. One can also place border trade in this category, particularly in the northern districts of our country. There is an opportunity in the Province of Balkh for the development of the meat industry, and for the establishment of an enterprise to process Astrakhan fur. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has prepared proposals concerning certain directions of joint cooperation to mutual advantage. I hope that in the very near future we will be able to commence specific work in this sphere.

[Pyadyshev] Many thanks to you, President Najibullah. We wish you great success.

Rebel Hits on Kabul Military Targets Denied

PM2811121789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondent S. Oposhnyanskiy report: "Kabul Shelled"]

[Excerpt] Kabul, 27 Nov—[Passage omitted] Today the Voice of America reported in the Dari language that, according to extremists' claims, there was a missile attack on Kabul military facilities. But not a single military facility in the vicinity of Kabul has been hit in many months. The rocket projectiles fell on bazaars, near bus stations, and at busy intersections. The killing of peaceful inhabitants was virtually the only form of "combat operation" by the opposition in which it can achieve success. According to figures from the Afghan Interior Ministry, yesterday's shelling killed 31 people, among whom there were 15 children who had been playing happily in the streets and four women. Ninety-six people were wounded.

Congratulations Sent to New Lebanese Premier

Supreme Soviet Presidium

PM2711164589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium undated message to new Lebanese president]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Ilyas al-Hirowi, president of Lebanon.

Heartfelt congratulations on your election as president of Lebanon. We sincerely wish you success in carrying out your crucial mission at this difficult time, when the Lebanese people must tackle the task of getting the country out of the protracted crisis and restoring national accord.

We assure you, Mr President, that the Soviet Union will continue to put all its energy into aiding the achievement of a Lebanese settlement and acting in defense of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity.

[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Council of Ministers Message

PM2711164789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers undated message to new Lebanese premier]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Salim al-Huss, prime minister of Lebanon.

We send you sincere congratulations on your appointment as prime minister of Lebanon and the approval of the government you head. It is yet another step in strengthening the process of a political settlement in Lebanon.

Please accept our best wishes for success in your crucial activity.

[Signed] The USSR Council of Ministers.

Navy Chief Chernavin Visits Algeria

LD1511000489 Moscow TASS in English 2222 GMT
14 Nov 89

[Text] Algiers November 15 TASS—General Secretary of the National Defence Ministry of Algeria M. Chellufi met on Tuesday Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy Admiral Vladimir Chernavin who is in Algeria on an official visit.

The Algerian statesman and the Soviet deputy defence minister discussed issues of mutual interest.

Minister Ends Kuwait Visit, Leaves for Iraq

LD1911200389 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT
19 Nov 89

[Text] Kuwait November 19 TASS—Soviet Minister of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises V. Chirskov ended his visit to Kuwait on Sunday after talks with Kuwaiti Oil Minister 'Ali al-Khalifah and heads of the two leading local firms—the Kuwait Petroleum Corporation and the Kuwaiti Oil Company.

The sides discussed prospects for expanding cooperation in the oil industry, including the setting up of joint ventures for operation in third countries and the holding of the second meeting of the standing Soviet-Kuwaiti Commission on Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

On Sunday, the Soviet minister and his entourage left for Iraq.

East Europe

Polish Premier Mazowiecki Ends Visit, Talks

23 Nov Welcoming Party Listed

PM2711153389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "T. Mazowiecki in Moscow"]

[Text] T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, arrived in Moscow 23 November on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

T. Mazowiecki was greeted at Vnukovo Airport at the aircraft ramp by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The following took part in the meeting: S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; M.S. Shkabardnya, administrator of affairs at the USSR Council of Ministers; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education; I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister; V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland; and other officials.

The welcoming party included S. Ciosek, Polish ambassador to the USSR, and embassy diplomatic staffers.

The Polish and USSR state flags were raised at the airport. An honor guard of Moscow Garrison troops was drawn up on the airfield. A band played the two countries' national anthems.

N.I. Ryzhkov and T. Mazowiecki reviewed the Soviet troop formation.

Meets With Ryzhkov 25 Nov

PM2711153989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] On 25 November USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov had a conversation with Polish Council of Ministers Chairman T. Mazowiecki. The government heads expressed satisfaction at the results of the previous day's talks, which confirmed the mutual desire for the further development and improvement of comprehensive, equal cooperation between the two countries and rapprochement between their peoples. Guided by this principled approach, the USSR and Polish Governments will do all they can to promote the creation of the essential conditions for the consistent strengthening of Soviet-Polish collaboration in the economic, scientific-technical, foreign policy, and other spheres and the active and extensive participation of enterprises and associations, labor collectives and individual citizens, and public and other organizations in it.

It was agreed that the relevant departments in both countries will continue to study a number of specific cooperation questions discussed during the talks and prepare proposals on their implementation.

During the frank and friendly conversation a number of other questions of mutual interest were touched on.

Aboimov Addresses Soviet Poles

LD2611014889 Warsaw PAP in English 2305 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 25—While taking the floor during Prime Minister Mazowiecki's meeting with Polonia here today, Soviet Foreign Vice-Minister Ivan Aboimov thanked for an invitation to take part in this interesting and beneficial exchange of views. He said such a meeting was held for the first time and that its significance was stemming from this fact.

Many problems facing Polonia which have been discussed here concern the two sides. Many of them can be solved only by joint effort. Even our presence here confirms the fact that the two sides are aiming at solving problems which have been touched upon during today's meeting, he said.

What has been discussed today fully reflects our official policy on nationalities, the policy of our party and the state, said Aboimov.

I hope that with joint effort and in close cooperation we will manage to solve many of these issues. However, I do not say that it will happen as early as tomorrow.

Visits Smolensk; Leaves for Leningrad

PM2811112189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Continuation of Visit"]

[Text] Smolensk, 27 Nov—T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, arrived in the hero-city of Smolensk today. He was accompanied on his trip by N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At the airport the head of Polish Government was met and seen off by A.I. Orlov, chairman of the Smolensk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee [Oblispolkom], and representatives of the public.

The guest was acquainted with the historical and architectural landmarks of the ancient Russian city. At the oblispolkom a talk took place during which T. Mazowiecki and the other members of the delegation were informed of the progress of perestroyka in the work of local organs of power and the progress of preparation for the elections, which for the first time will be held on an alternative basis. There was a constructive exchange of opinions on the opportunities for developing cooperation and direct ties between enterprises of the USSR and Poland. In particular, the successful collaboration between Soviet and Polish construction workers in the installation of the Smolensk nuclear electric power station was noted.

T. Mazowiecki and those accompanying him visited the Katyn forest where Polish officers and Soviet servicemen who died during the Great Patriotic War are buried. The eminent guest laid wreaths at the memorial erected in their memory. A wreath was also laid at the eternal flame of glory on Heroes' Memory Square.

On the same day T. Mazowiecki visited Troitse-Sergiyeva Monastery in Zagorsk. During a talk with priests the need was noted to strengthen mutual understanding and ensure spiritual rapprochement both between individual people and between entire peoples.

On 27 November T. Mazowiecki left Moscow for Leningrad.

At Vnukovo airport T. Mazowiecki was seen off at the gangway by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Taking part in the sendoff were S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; M.S. Shkabardnya, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education; I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

At the airport the state flags of Poland and the USSR were hoisted. A guard of honor of troops from Moscow garrison was formed on the runway. The band played the two countries' state anthems.

N.I. Ryzhkov and T. Mazowiecki inspected the Soviet servicemen.

The sendoff ceremony ended with the passing in review of the guard of honor.

The two countries' state flags were hung out along the route taken by the motorcade accompanied by an escort of motorcyclists on the capital's streets and squares.

T. Mazowiecki is being accompanied on his tour of the country by N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland, and S. Ciosek, Polish ambassador to the USSR.

Visits Leningrad 27 Nov

LD2711174289 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Leningrad November 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Chumakov:

Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki spent the last day of an official visit to the Soviet Union in Leningrad.

The guest went to the monument to Leningrad's heroic defenders in Victory Square and placed flowers.

At the Piskarev Memorial Cemetery, the Polish prime minister honoured the memory of Leningraders and soldiers who perished during the siege of the city. Mazowiecki placed a wreath at the monument to the grieving mother.

During a conversation at the executive committee of the Leningrad City Soviet, its Chairman Vladimir Khodyrev told the Polish premier about ties that Leningrad enterprises and organisations maintain with Polish partners, also as contacts between sister-cities.

Khodyrev answered questions about transformations in the political and economic spheres, in work collectives, as well as during the preparation for the forthcoming local government elections.

In the afternoon Mazowiecki went to the Hermitage Museum and saw its collection of works of art. In the House of Friendship and Peace With Foreign Peoples, he met representatives of the Leningrad intelligentsia.

Summing up the results of his visit to the Soviet Union, Mazowiecki said that "no matter who is forming and heading the Polish Government, relations between the two countries should develop in the spirit of friendship and cooperation. The visit confirmed the sides' adherence to this line."

The Polish prime minister said it is particularly important that he met leaders and was able to learn their opinions and views on the present situation in the Soviet Union and Poland.

Mazowiecki said that the dialogue was profound and useful. It opens up real roads for the normalisation of relations regarding issues of a historic and economic character, on which the two countries differ.

This is important for the further development of cooperation between the two countries, he stressed.

Mazowiecki said that it is important to realise that in the economic area relations should be built on a new basis, that of the market, and should be equally profitable for both sides.

Departs Leningrad for Warsaw

LD2711204289 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Leningrad November 27 TASS—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki flew from Leningrad to Warsaw this evening. At the Pulkovo Airport he was seen off by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov, Leningrad Mayor Vladimir Khodyrev and other officials.

Mazowiecki Speaks for 'Majority' of Poles

PM2711150389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 p 3

["Political Portrait" by own correspondent V. Shutkevich: "Premier. Who Tadeusz Mazowiecki Is"]

[Text] Warsaw—"I come as a man of 'Solidarity,' faithful to the legacy of August. To my understanding, this legacy consists, above all, in the desire of our whole society to be not the object but the subject of politics, to determine the country's destiny itself...." This was how Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki began his program speech in the Polish Sejm. A speech which was soon interrupted for an incomprehensible reason. Bent over his text in a rather round-shouldered manner and adjusting his glasses, the premier was still uttering some words, but his voice was becoming increasingly weak in the loudspeakers. Finally, Mazowiecki turned to Professor M. Kozakiewicz, who was chairing the Sejm session, asked for a recess to be announced, and quietly left the hall. Deputies of both chambers were literally struck dumb with surprise. Then the entire hall began buzzing in alarm....

The premier was absent for 40 minutes. I do not know where Mazowiecki spent them—in the vicinity of the Sejm or in one of its offices—and I do not know what he was thinking while fighting the weakness which had suddenly come on. But it so happened that the premier's temporary absence lent unexpected weight to the start of his speech for us journalists, as well as for everyone in the hall. We tried to imagine its continuation and pondered on the words which Mazowiecki had managed to utter. "I come as a man of 'Solidarity...'" What does this mean?

Of course, he had to begin with "Solidarity." If only because, looking soberly at things, without it he simply would not have become a politician on such a scale. Prior to "Solidarity's" return to the arena of political life, Tadeusz Mazowiecki had been one of L. Walesa's little-known advisers. Following the trade union's legalization in March of this year, he became chief editor of the weekly SOLIDARNOSC, which had been published at the beginning of the 80's and was revived this year. Although Poles had begun to get used to his name, they still did not know his face. Even after the June triumph, when "Solidarity" won the elections, Mazowiecki continued to remain in the shadow: He submitted his candidacy for neither the Sejm nor the Senate. Only in the middle of August did people begin speaking of him for the first time as a potential candidate for the premiership (two other names were also mentioned, which were far better known to Polish society—B. Geremek and J. Kuron). But less than 1 month later Mazowiecki had already been confirmed in the post of cabinet head. However, before the matter went to a vote in the Senate and the Sejm and even before the corresponding decision was adopted by the Citizens' Parliamentary Club, which unites the "Solidarity" deputies, Lech Walesa had to confirm Mazowiecki in that post. "Solidarity's" chief reminded his comrades of that fact with unequivocal frankness when they were on the point of attempting to accuse him of being dictatorial and undemocratic: "I made the premier for you." The premier—yes, perhaps, although Walesa's will would hardly have been carried out, in my view, if it had not coincided with the will of the overwhelming majority of Poles. The premier, but not the man...

Mazowiecki had to begin with "Solidarity" because he had risen so high precisely on the "Solidarity" wave. But he shaped up as a thinking person conscious of himself and his place in the world long before "Solidarity" began to take shape. His own ethic is founded on the ethic and morality of Christianity and on the system of values of Catholicism, by which Mazowiecki has been greatly influenced since childhood. The prime minister of Poland is not only a profoundly religious man, he also regularly performs religious rites. In December 1981, while interned together with other "Solidarity" activists, Mazowiecki very much regretted, as he himself recalled later in his book, the fact that their place of imprisonment "did not have even a Bible, which it was very important for us to read at that time." He was once close to Cardinal Wyszynski, and the first cleric whose blessing he received on the day he became premier was Pope John Paul II.

So does this mean that Mazowiecki is a man of the church? Yes, the Polish press writes this about him, although it is pointed out at the same time that he has never been an orthodox Catholic and has always retained the right of independent judgment. Even when taking his leave of Cardinal Wyszynski at his coffin, Mazowiecki did not deem it necessary to conceal the fact in his speech that a certain difference of opinion had existed between him and the deceased. Also significant is his attitude to abortion, which is now being discussed heatedly in Poland. As is known, the official church is trying to have parliament adopt a law banning abortion and providing for severe punishment for women who disobey the law. While agreeing that abortions are a very undesirable thing from the viewpoint of Christian morality, at the same time Mazowiecki believes it inadmissible for the state to interfere in this intimate sphere: Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's... In reply to a question from journalists as to whether he intends to introduce compulsory religious education in schools, Mazowiecki remarked: "As a Catholic and as someone who has long been fighting an ideologized state, I do not want to replace one such concept with another." And further: "The Polish state can be neither ideologized nor religious. It must be a state in which no citizen will be discriminated against or encouraged for his world outlook or political convictions."

What are the political convictions of Mazowiecki himself? As many observers here point out, it is hard to boil them down to any definite doctrine or party platform, although in one of his articles, for example, Mazowiecki appeals to Jan Strzelecki and Edward Lipinski, who have adhered to the traditions of the Polish Socialist Party, to be allies. Broadly speaking, his views are a denial of totalitarianism and violence as a means of resolving social conflicts and an assertion of man's right to dissidence and pluralism in political life. The 23-year-old Mazowiecki began voicing them in public in the Catholic weekly DZIS I JUTRO (TODAY AND TOMORROW) in the mid-1950's. Then he developed these views at sessions of the Warsaw Catholic Intelligentsia Club and in the pages of the monthly WIEZ (TIES), whose founder and editor he became in 1957. In postwar Poland many of his articles were perceived as manifesting selfish opposition, although at the time Mazowiecki was not yet, of course, a member of the opposition in the later meaning of the word. Mazowiecki first set up in clear opposition to the authorities in 1968 when, together with a group of other parliament deputies, he publicly condemned "the persecution of students and the anti-Semitic campaign mounted by a section of the country's leadership."

On laying down his powers as a deputy, Mazowiecki concentrated entirely on producing the magazine WIEZ, which was assuming an increasingly oppositional nature. It is significant that at that same time the displeasure of the official authorities was frequently being aroused also by articles in another printed publication—the weekly POLITYKA, whose editor was M. Rakowski. Of course, there is no question here of any ideological closeness between them. This fact merely confirms, as A. Krzeminski rightly wrote, that at that time people were emerging onto the road to reforms from different sides.

Let us state without reservation: Mazowiecki was not a supporter of socialism, at least in the form in which it had evolved in Poland, and, unlike other opposition figures who crossed over to "Solidarity's" banners from the ranks of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], never changed his views. However, already at that time, just as now, political realism, consideration, and farsightedness were his characteristics. And these qualities of the premier's were fully manifested when he formed his cabinet. In reply to a question from a TIME magazine correspondent, who asked whether his accession to power meant the end of communism in Poland, Mazowiecki stated (after a long pause for thought, the reporter pointed out): "The changes occurring in Poland would have been impossible without the support of party members. We must pay tribute to them for the initiative of holding the 'Roundtable.' The party reformers paid a high price for this during the June parliamentary elections. But it sometimes happens in politics and in history that it is by no means the guilty ones who pay...."

Mazowiecki has repeatedly emphasized that a thick line separates his policy from that of previous governments. However, as TRYBUNA LUDU reasonably wrote, the premier's first specific steps have essentially pointed in the same direction as his predecessors were moving in. In fact, in the very makeup of the cabinet formed by Mazowiecki he has realized the idea of a broad coalition government, which the party had advanced even before the elections. And much in the new government's activity appears a continuation of the reforms begun by M. Rakowski's government.

At the first stage, Mazowiecki's cabinet intends to demonopolize the economy, repeal all the instructions which restricted freedom of economic activity, and then achieve the convertibility of the Polish zloty—which is expected to lead to a reduction in imports and an expansion of exports. The next step is to be the administration's total abandonment of price control and the elimination of state subsidies. This will make it possible to achieve equilibrium between the volume of goods in the country and the amount of money that the population has. The budget deficit will also be reduced by cutting all state spending, including spending on the militia and the army, and increasing taxes. At the same time the privatization of state property will be carried out—at first on a comparatively small scale (apartments, stores, means of production). Then small and medium enterprises will pass into private hands, and the possibility of their being sold to foreign owners is not ruled out. If the program is implemented consistently and vigorously, it will take the country 2-3 years to emerge from the crisis. But, as it is not hard to note, practically any one of these operations will be accompanied by further price increases and a lowering of real living standards. The hope of emerging from the crisis without additional sacrifices is, of course, utopian—this is also understood by practically everyone in Poland. But sacrifices must also be fair and affect everyone equally. Will it not turn out that the poorest, those who live from wage to wage, will suffer more than others? Having familiarized itself with the government's economic program, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo has so far refrained from making a final assessment of it....

The premier is firmly shaping his own course: "For us to have things better, things must get still worse." And they are—day by day. Official statistics report: In October the country's industry cut back production still further, and there were still fewer goods in the stores. Whereas only 1 year ago a loaf of bread in Warsaw cost Z35, and 1 month ago Z640, it now costs Z840. Not even GAZETA WYBORCZA could contain itself: "Prices have gone quite crazy!" There is a growing number of people in the country who live below the poverty line. According to sociologists' data, in 1987 they made up 2 percent of the population. Today it is 20 percent. But here is the paradox: According to the same sociologists' polls, the number of Poles who believe that the situation will still change for the better increased 5 percent in November compared with September. Some 77 percent of those polled declared that they trust the premier. Probably not a single politician in this country has had such a fund of confidence in recent decades. The peasants have agreed to grant Mazowiecki's government a kind of credit in the form of additional grain deliveries, for which they agree to be paid only 1 year later. Responding to the premier's appeal, workers at certain mines have voluntarily agreed to go to work on Saturdays, although they themselves had demanded that the previous government make Saturday a day off.

But, in order to utilize this opportunity, external credits are needed in addition to internal ones. The country is in debt not only to the West but also to us, in the USSR. Today it has a negative balance with us of R6 billion or $1.5 billion. What is to be done about this? This question, among others, will be discussed during T. Mazowiecki's official visit to our country. Today the Polish premier will meet with M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, and other Soviet leaders. As T. Mazowiecki has repeatedly emphasized, cooperation with the Soviet Union is an extremely important question for Poland. We also favor the development of such cooperation on a new, mutually advantageous basis. But it will be able to develop successfully only when relations between our peoples are truly friendly.

Of course, time will answer many questions. But we must understand today that Mazowiecki is coming to us not as a man of "Solidarity" or of the church but as the prime minister of a sovereign state which is close to us, who expresses the will of the majority of his fellow citizens. Let us remember this when receiving him here. As well as in the future, incidentally.

CPSU-PZPR Seminar Held in Kursk 22 Nov

PM2711112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondents M. Tretyakov and N. Utkin: "Strengthening Unity"]

[Text] Kursk, 22 Nov—The further development of interparty ties and the exchange of experience of party work under the conditions of the perestroyka being implemented in the Soviet Union and the sociopolitical transformations in Poland, the improvement of the mechanism of economic cooperation between twinned oblasts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and Polish voivodships—these and other questions were the focus of attention of the participants in a zonal seminar of secretaries of CPSU oblast committees [obkoms] and Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] voivodship committees that has ended in Kursk.

Local friendly ties between the Soviet Union and Poland are characterized today by the high degree of dynamism of mutual contacts. Their volumes have increased nearly eightfold in the past 5 years. Poland accounts for about 40 percent of the entire volume of the USSR's cooperation with the socialist countries through local ties.

Last year alone mutual exchange reached nearly 78,000 people. Of these about 2,000 travelled through party committee channels.

Addressing the seminar, Yu. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said:

The CPSU proceeds from the premise that the fraternal ties between our parties, established and checked by time, cannot lose their significance whatever turns social development may experience in our country. On the contrary, more complex circumstances should help ensure that these ties acquire a new quality and that mutual support acquires a new dimension.

We should like to stress that in this complex time for our Polish friends the CPSU leadership and the leadership of the local party organizations, like all communists, have an unswerving desire to continue and develop relations with the fraternal PZPR.

The holding of such meetings, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted, reflects consistency in our parties' policies and their mutual attention toward the essence of the processes taking place in each other's countries and their desire to analyze trends.

We are faced with the need, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted in conclusion, to develop time-tested forms and methods for ties between local CPSU and PZPR party organizations and to elaborate and implement new ones, with a consideration for social development in Poland and perestroyka in the USSR. These ideas were also confirmed with new force by the two sides during the recent working visit to the USSR by M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. Important significance attaches to ridding our ties of excessive centralization and organization and transferring the center of gravity to the level of local party organs and primary party organizations.

The PZPR's loss of the leading role in the country after the June parliamentary elections has considerably complicated its position. The party's future is seen in different ways by its members. Diametrically opposed opinions are being voiced. How can it emerge from this crisis and restore the working people's trust and the party's prestige? This was discussed in his speech by J. Szmajdzinski, chief of the PZPR Central Committee party work section.

The political changes taking place in Poland, he noted, are being widely discussed in the party. As before, some PZPR members cannot come to terms with the party's loss of its leading role in the state. They are critical of the policy of the party leadership, especially the former leadership. Various opinions are being voiced today regarding the PZPR's future, basically in terms of changing the statute and program of the party, which should be a party of democratic socialism, social justice, and the struggle for equal opportunities for man's development. It will be a party that unites people employed in manual and mental labor, a party capable of effectively waging a political struggle, a party open to new ideas and alliances.

At a crucial moment, the speaker continued, the PZPR is not shutting itself away in its own affairs alone. We are attentively following and analyzing the activity of the CPSU and the other parties of the socialist countries. We want to take an active part in the overall process of transformations and to make our contribution to it. In this connection J. Szmajdzinski stressed the importance of local interparty cooperation. A special role is assigned to collaboration locally that will enable members of the PZPR and representatives of the Polish people to familiarize themselves comprehensively with the progress and results of perestroyka in the USSR. On the other hand, we are seeking to explain in your country that the Polish left-wingers are actively restructuring their organizational structure and do not intend to leave the family of the socialist countries' parties.

An analysis of the present state of Soviet-Polish relations and mutual contacts between the CPSU and the PZPR with a consideration for the altered distribution of political forces in Poland was given in his speech by R. Fedorov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. The Soviet Union, he said, is sincerely interested in resolving the profound socioeconomic crisis that is destroying fraternal Poland's normal life. Consequently, Soviet policy should also be interested in the success of those measures T. Mazowiecki's government will take to lead the country out of the crisis. Here we in no way close our eyes to the growth of elements in the situation in Poland and in the policy of the present Polish authorities that could, if they develop, cast gloom on Soviet-Polish cooperation. The Soviet side has pointed and will continue to point to this factor.

Touching on interparty contacts, the speaker noted the Soviet side's resolve to continue to develop them on the basis of the principles of equality, independence, and mutual responsibility. We are interested in ensuring that in the present situation, a complex one for our friends, we do not allow a substantial reduction in the volume of cooperation, that we reinforce the tested and verified forms of collaboration, and that we supplement them with new forms developed with a consideration for the current moment.

A. Seleznev, first secretary of the Kursk party obkom, spoke of the effectiveness of cooperation with Skierniewice Voivodship. About 2,000 Polish specialists have been working for 10 years now on the construction of the nuclear electric power station in Kurchatov City, he said. They have already carried out a volume of construction and installation work worth a little over R60 million. And all the establishments erected by the Polish friends are distinguished by their high quality.

The speeches of a number of representatives of the Polish side, including E. Goraj, first secretary of the PZPR Voivodship Committee in Skierniewice, expressed wishes for the broader involvement of workers collectives in cooperation, the creation of joint ventures, and the expansion of tourist exchange.

The Polish friends spoke with alarm of the complex situation in which the PZPR committees are having to work now. New forces that are not always helping to deepen and expand Soviet-Polish friendly ties are now operating on Poland's political scene, Z. Cyktor, first secretary of the party voivodship committee in Walbrzych, noted. Anti-Soviet feelings are being kindled in the country and historical facts in the two countries' relations are being deliberately distorted. With a view to countering these negative trends, it is essential to expand mutual contacts between ordinary people, those who work at the lathes and in the fields.

The results of the strenuous and fruitful work were summed up in the concluding part of the seminar by Yu. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and L. Miller, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee.

The participants in the meeting laid flowers at the monument to V.I. Lenin.

Ye. Razumov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadres Work Department, responsible workers of the CPSU Central Committee, and representatives of Soviet Government, public, and youth organizations took part in the work of the seminar.

L. Miller, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; J. Kubasiewicz, first secretary of the Warsaw PZPR Committee; and responsible workers of the PZPR Central Committee took part in the meeting on the Polish side.

Lukyanov Accepts Polish Envoy's Credentials

PM2411145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Presentation of Credentials"]

[Text] On 22 November Stanislaw Ciosek, Polish ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, presented his credentials in the Kremlin to A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

It has fallen to me, the ambassador stated, to represent Poland and its highest state authority in the fraternal country which is our most important ally and partner in the sphere of political, economic, scientific, and cultural cooperation. The Polish-Soviet alliance is founded on a reliable base of joint interests embracing both bilateral relations and the sphere of international politics.

It was noted that friendship with the Soviet Union is needed for the people's Poland since it is the main factor guaranteeing the security and the inviolability of Polish borders. The existence of a strong, independent, and allied Poland accords with Soviet interests. Proceeding from this, the Polish Government has striven and is continuing to strive toward the comprehensive development of Polish-Soviet cooperation in the political, economic, and cultural spheres and in the international arena.

Accepting the credentials on behalf of the Presidium and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A.I. Lukyanov noted that the consistently developing Soviet-Polish relations are based on the principles of sovereign equality, freedom of choice, consideration of mutual interests, respect for each country's independence, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. In its ties with Poland the Soviet Union invariably proceeds from maintaining continuity in our relations. It can be stated with satisfaction that the new Polish state leadership also intends to adhere to this course.

Official statements by the Polish Government about relations with the USSR, about adherence to bilateral treaties and Warsaw Pact organization commitments, A.I. Lukyanov continued, testify to the coincidence of our views on the most basic questions. The consolidation of everything positive which has been reached in the decades of cooperation between our allied states and the search for long-term forms and means of cooperation accords with the vital interests of the two friendly neighboring peoples. The Soviet Union in close cooperation with Poland intends to continue to follow the course of the socialist countries agreed within the framework of the Warsaw Pact organization, and directed at ensuring peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole. A new impetus must be given to cooperation through CEMA.

After the presentation of credentials there was a warm, friendly conversation between A.I. Lukyanov and S. Ciosek in which I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and E.L. Kuzmin, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat Department of International Relations, took part.

CSSR Unrest, Political Developments Reported

News Conference on Leadership Changes

PM2711140589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "Decisions of CPCZ Central Committee Plenum Announced"]

[Text] Prague—An extraordinary Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee plenum ended its work in Prague at 0200 hours 25 November. Having accepted the collective resignation of the Central Committee Presidium and Secretariat, the plenum elected 48-year-old Karel Urbanek general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. CSSR President G. Husak is not on the newly elected Presidium. CSSR Prime Minister L. Adamec, K. Hoffmann, A. Indra, and J. Fojtik were not reelected to the Presidium. Three new Presidium members were elected—M. Huscava, a worker from Ostrava, J. Cizek, an agricultural cooperative member, and M. Zajic, Central Committee secretary for agricultural questions.

About 1,000 foreign journalists spent hours waiting for the promised press conference. The newsmen learned of the plenum's results only at 0300 hours. The results were announced by Z. Horeni, member of the Central Committee Secretariat and chief editor of RUDE PRAVO, who chaired the press conference.

The document adopted by the plenum declares that the former party Central Committee leadership failed to cope with the situation in the last few days. The plenum perceived as a political error the use of force against participants in the 17 November student demonstration and demanded that the causes of events be thoroughly investigated and the culprits punished. The authorities must not use force when solving various problems, the CPCZ Central Committee plenum declared. The CPCZ will embark on a public dialogue with all who respect the country's constitution. This dialogue will be based on mutual respect between all organizations and citizens, between all who are interested in the motherland's future. Democratic elections to organs of people's power will be prepared. There is a declaration about inequalities between political parties operating in the country and about the persistent need to adopt new laws—on freedom of assembly and association, on youth, on the press, and on defense.

The CPCZ Central Committee does not perceive strikes and protest demonstrations as acceptable methods of solving acute questions, and it relies on its fellow-citizens' wisdom.

Dozens of questions were addressed to the press conference chairman.

Here are a few questions and answers:

[Question] How would you briefly describe the new CPCZ leadership?

[Answer] Very efficient people who want to do everything for the good of our republic.

[Question] Did the plenum discuss the question of events in 1968?

[Answer] No. It discussed events in 1989.

[Question] Will the plenum decisions put an end to the ongoing demonstrations?

[Answer] We hope for prudence.

[Question] Do you believe that the new leadership will be able to cope with the situation?

[Answer] Time will tell.

[Question] When did General Secretary Jakes decide to resign?

[Answer] He made his decision during the plenum.

[Question] Did Comrade Strougal (for years the head of the CSSR Government) speak?

[Answer] He spoke on several occasions, suggesting ways out of the crisis situation. You will find out in greater detail in RUDE PRAVO on Monday or Tuesday.

[Question] Will the formula of the CPCZ's leading role be retained?

[Answer] I am convinced that our new constitution will not contain this article in its present form. The CPCZ, together with the other National Front parties and organizations, will seek a new formula. It must be emphasized with the utmost certainty that the National Front is the basis of our political system. At the same time, it is indisputable that the CPCZ will continue to play an important role in this system. [answer ends]

Z. Horeni also said that, in his opinion, cadre changes in the leadership will be proposed at the next CPCZ Central Committee plenum, which will adopt the party's action program.

Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, was born in a peasant family in Bojkovice village (South Moravian Kraj) in 1941. He has been a member of the CPCZ since 1962.

He worked as a railroad station chief. In 1973 he moved to work in the South Moravian CPCZ Kraj Committee. At the same time, he pursued part-time studies at the CPCZ Central Committee Higher Political School. He became secretary of the Brno City CPCZ Committee in 1982, and first secretary of the city committee in 1984. In 1988 he became chief of the CPCZ Central Committee Organizational-Political Department, and in the same year was elected member of the Central Committee Presidium and headed the newly constituted party work committee in the Czech Socialist Republic.

26 Nov Meetings With Opposition

LD2611163689 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 26 TASS—Representatives of the National Front of Czechoslovakia and head of the Federal Government Ladislav Adamec met with activists of the Civil Forum in Prague.

There is also a meeting of representatives of Czechoslovakia's Communist Party Central Committee with members of the Club Revival, which unites former prominent leaders of the "Prague Spring".

In the Prague Park a meeting was held by the city committee of the Young Socialist League and the Civil Forum.

A meeting of Prague people is gathered in the Letna Field again.

Leaders of party organisations of Prague who met today demanded that the events of 1968-1969 and the subsequent period in the country's life be reappraised.

An extraordinary plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is planned to be held in the evening.

Premier Resigns Over Slow Pace of Reform

PM2711135189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

["IZVESTIYA Press Service" report: "On the Events in Czechoslovakia"]

[Text] At a sitting of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee Presidium Saturday evening it was decided to convene a CPCZ Central Committee plenum 26 November to discuss urgent organizational and political issues.

K. Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, spoke on television Saturday evening. He said the party has found itself isolated from the people and the truth. Stressing that the party must sit down at the negotiating table with everyone who is prepared to make a positive contribution to the country's future, he said: I will do business with anyone—either within the framework of the National Front or outside it—who wishes to cooperate with us and who is prepared to help us with action or advice.

On the eve of this speech, demonstrations involving as many as half a million people continued in Prague. Attention is being focused on questions connected with the changes in leading party organs and also with the general strike planned for Monday.

A communist aktiv meeting of secretaries of primary party organizations has been held in Prague's Palace of Culture. The draft resolution read out stated dissatisfaction with the CPCZ Central Committee plenum decisions and also with the reelection of M. Stepan, first secretary of the Prague Party City Committee, and M. Zavadil, chairman of the Central Trade Union Council, to the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium. Addressing the aktiv meeting, M. Stepan said that he and the leadership of the party city committee had decided to resign. The subsequent party city committee plenum elected new leading organs and a new first secretary of the city party committee. He is Viktor Pazler.

The situation in the country has been discussed at an emergency sitting of the CSSR Government. In its statement the government spoke in favor of broadening its ranks with representatives of other political parties and nonparty people. It recommended to the president of the CSSR that a decision be made to end the persecution of citizens on political grounds.

After the sitting a government spokesman informed journalists of the circumstances of L. Adamec's resignation from the posts of member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR Government. The main reason for this decision is his disagreement with the slow pace of reform, primarily in the political sphere. Adamec refused to join the new CPCZ Central Committee Presidium elected Friday.

According to news agencies, demonstrations have also been held in the capital of the Slovak Socialist Republic, Bratislava, involving more than 100,000 people. Quoting Czechoslovak television, REUTER reported that a number of Communists in Slovakia are opposed to J. Lenart's reelection to the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

Developments at CPCZ Plenum Noted

PM2711193589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Kornilov under the "Panorama of International Events" rubric: "CSSR: Course of Events Speeding Up"]

[Text] Prague—The Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee Plenum in Prague is over. A report was delivered by Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the Party Central Committee. In the words of the organisers of the press conference for foreign journalists which began on this occasion immediately after the plenum ended, at 0300, the "plenum was tough going."

The plenum relieved M. Zavadil, J. Lenart, and M. Stepan of their duties as members of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and relieved J. Haman from his duties as candidate member of the Presidium. The following have been elected new members of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium: Bretislav Benda, Miroslav Valek, Hana Kozesnikova, Antonin Mlady, Vasil Mohorita, Valeria Petrincova, and Ondrej Saling. V. Mohorita and O. Saling are new secretaries of the Central Committee.

The CPCZ Central Committee general secretary recommended the creation on the National Front platform of a broad political coalition and equal association of parties and public organizations and groups which are prosocialism. The speaker advocated the reorganization of the federal and republic governments to ensure that representatives of other political parties and nonparty people become part of them.

The plenum resolved to convene an extraordinary CPCZ congress on 26 January 1990.

Sunday in Czechoslovakia was as tumultuous as it had been on preceding days. The morning began with a meeting between delegations of the CSSR National Front and Civic Forum. The former was headed by Federal Premier Ladislav Adamec, the latter by playwright and public figure Vaclav Havel. The meeting lasted around 1 hour. The National Front delegation consisted of 11 people, including Bohuslav Kucera, chairnman of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party and Vasil Mohorita, chairman of the Socialist Youth Union Central Committee. The Forum delegation was much larger. Virtually everyone from each side spoke. "Everyone was conscious of the seriousness of the moment and of their political responsibility," Government press spokesman M. Pavel said. L. Adamec expressed the wish that Monday's planned strike be in the nature of a demonstration rather than confrontation. A further meeting of the sides is scheduled for Monday, when there will be discussion of how the demands put forward by the Civic Forum are to be carried out.

"Dialogue between the authorities and the public has begun," Vaclav Havel announced to demonstrators at Letna about an hour later. The wind was blowing, snow falling, and it was freezing, but again people came there. There were somewhat fewer than on Saturday. While there were around 800,000 people then, there seemed to be 500,000-600,000 on Sunday. L. Adamec was invited on to the rostrum at the Sparta Stadium and addressed the assembly. His speech was met with fervent applause and the chanting of his name—until, that is, he observed that "there is no need to strike for 2 hours, a few minutes is enough." This produced boos and shouts of "It's not enough!" However, Vaclav Havel, Alexander Dubcek, and other speakers then spoke in support of the federal premier.

The same day an extraordinary session of the Central Council of Trade Unions was held at which its chairman, Miroslav Zavadil, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium, tendered his own resignation and that of the other members of the leadership. A plenum of the Slovak Communist Party [CPSL] Central Committee was held at which a report was delivered by Ignac Janak, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and first secretary of the CPSL Central Committee. The plenum will be continuing its work on Monday. A session of the Prague City CPCZ Committee was held which relieved M. Stepan of his duties as first secretary of the city committee and placed Viktor Pazler at the head of the Prague Party organization. Extraordinary plenums of virtually all CPCZ kraj [county] committees, sessions of national committees, and meetings between representatives of the authorities at local level with the public were held. A meeting between a CPCZ Central Committee delegation and representatives of the For Socialist Restructuring-Rebirth Club (a public organization which was founded at the beginning of this year and which includes many former CPCZ members expelled from the party in 1969-1970 among its members) took place. A session of the Presidium and Secretariat of the Czechoslovak People's Party was held, where it was acknowledged that the party leadership had lost the confidence of its members and was therefore collectively resigning. Numerous assemblies and rallies took place throughout the country. People joined hands to form human chains in many cities.

The need for a radical reassessment of the events of 1968 was expressed both at the meeting of the aktiv in Prague and at the CPSL Central Committee Plenum (in Comrade Janak's report). The CPSL Central Committee first secretary stated that the array of problems facing society could not be solved without this step. He also said that the party must enter into contact with those expelled from the CPCZ in connection with the events of 1968-1969 and propose to those who so wish that they return to the party ranks and take part in the process of renewal. It is proposed to draw up all these theses as points in a plenum resolution.

Did everyone support the idea of a strike? No. For example, Communists at the Skoda plant, the country's largest industrial concern, opposed it. Brno transport workers stated that, because of the specific nature of their work, they would only strike for 5 minutes. Nevertheless, at exactly noon on Monday I heard the slow wail of factory sirens—the strike had started. This 2-hour strike-cum-demonstration is designed to demonstrate working people's unity and solidarity in the struggle for a genuine renewal of society.

Communists are showing special concern and anxiety over the future of the country and the future of their party. Bitter, utterly frank words were expressed at an aktiv meeting of secretaries of Prague primary party organizations whose meeting is into its second day at the Palace of Culture. City, plant, and shop party assemblies are being held everywhere.

The CPCZ Central Committee Plenum, as I pointed out at the beginning, opened on the evening of 26 November. And yet less than 48 hours had passed sinced the previous one had finished.... How do you explain such a short interval, such a swift decision to assemble again? By just one thing—the demand of the people. Both Communists and nonparty people criticized the decisions of the previous plenum for being inadequate and wishy-washy. This voice could not be ignored. Yes, life has demonstrated that both the leadership and members of the Central Committee underestimated the dramatic nature of the present moment when they wound up the "day-before-yesterday plenum."

Comples Situation, CPCZ Disunity Noted

PM2711192589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent S. Vtorushin: "Czechoslovakia: Extraordinary Congress Called"]

[Text] Prague, 27 Nov—The social and political situation in Czechoslovakia remains complex even after the extraordinary plenum of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee, which ended in the early hours of Saturday morning. Many people, including Communists, were not happy with the composition of the new party leadership.

A meeting of chairmen of Prague City primary party organizations passed a vote of no confidence in Miroslav Stepan, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and first secretary of the city committee. Miroslav Zavadil, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and leader of the Czechoslovak trade unions, also received a vote of no confidence. The capital's Communists demanded the convening of a new Central Committee plenum and an extraordinary party congress. The same demands were made in many other party organizations.

For the first time in the past 20 years Communists have raised the question of a review of the party's stance on the events of 1968. At the Slovak Communist Party Central Committee plenum these events were described as an attempt to reform society and renew socialism. A reappraisal of the 1968 events is laid down as a condition of the people's renewed trust in the implementation of restructuring.

The many rallies and meetings that are currently being held are calling for dialogue among the participants in the current political events. The first practical steps are being taken to establish it.

No newspapers at all publish in Czechoslovakia on Sundays. RUDE PRAVO journalists and print workers decided to make an exception. They published a reduced-format edition of their paper, printing CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Karel Urbanek's television speech on Saturday and some of the plenum participants' speeches. This edition of the newspaper was distributed free of charge on the streets and in the squares by the journalists themselves.

That evening the second CPCZ Central Committee plenum of the past 3 days was held in the Higher Party School building. A discussion of the current political situation and organizational matters were items on the agenda. It was addressed by CPCZ Central Committee General Secretary K. Urbanek. He proposed holding an extraordinary party congress to consider the current situation and the party's tasks up to the 18th congress and to elect a new Central Committee and Central Control and Auditing Commission. The plenum decreed that an extraordinary congress should be convened on 26 January 1990.

The plenum examined some personnel matters. Seven new CPCZ Central Committee Presidium members were elected. Miroslav Stepan and Jozef Lenart, who had been reelected CPCZ Central Committee Presidium members in the early hours of Saturday morning, were relieved of these posts. Josef Haman, first secretary of the Central Bohemian Kraj Party Committee, and Vladimir Herman, first secretary of the South Moravian Kraj Party Committee, also lost their posts as candidate members of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

The situation in the country remains complex. Commenting on the decision to convene an extraordinary party congress, the paper RUDE PRAVO writes that its chief task is to overhaul the Central Committee and devise an action program that would unite all Communists. Past days have shown, the paper notes, that the current Central Committee is incapable of expressing and formulating demands that correspond to the urgent tasks of the times and that reflect Communists' vital interests. This is indicated by the need that has emerged for repeat leadership elections. Only a congress and a new Central Committee can mobilize the party, restore its confidence in itself, and put it back at the head of the struggle for progress, democracy, and humanitarian ideals.

CPCZ 'Losing Popularity' Daily

LD2711205689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by Sergey Andreyev from the CSSR]

[Text] There are several main events today: first of all, a general 2-hour strike from 1200 to 1400. However, there were fairly large collectives that did not join in the strike. It is noteworthy that at enterprises taking part in the strike, Communists are joining their collectives beneath slogans calling for further perestroyka and democratization.

Material on the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which began yesterday, was published today. Three Presidium members were dismissed from their posts, seven new members were elected, including some workers, and also Vasil Mohorita, head of the Union of Socialist Youth. Karel Urbanek spoke at the plenum. It was decided to convene an extraordinary party congress on 26 January 1990. The congress will set up new leading bodies. Delegates to the congress will be elected at regional party conferences.

Here are two remarks on these decisions. The party is losing popularity, at the moment, as fast as the Civic Forum and other parties and public organizations are gaining it. And the situation is changing every few hours. Many primary party organizations have proposed that an emergency congress be convened as soon as possible and that delegates be elected directly at primary party organizations at works, factories, etc. Will the decisions of the plenum satisfy Communists? We still have no response? [video shows large rally with speakers addressing it; copy of RUDE PRAVO; Urbanek speaking at plenum, general views of plenum; more views of rally in streets]

General Strike, CPCZ 'Crisis' Noted

PM2811113589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[V. Rzhevskiy dispatch under general heading: "CPCZ Central Committee Plenum Held"]

[Text] Prague—At the call of students and the informal "Civic Forum" association, the overwhelming majority of plants and factories stopped work and work in organizations and institutions came to a standstill for 2 hours on Monday. Work schedules were maintained only where people's health and lives were at stake or where the production rhythm necessitates continuous work.

Revolutionary perestroyka from below. This is the turn events have taken in Czechoslovakia in the last few days. The chains which for years fettered free thought, people's initiative, and the Czechoslovak Communist Party's [CPCZ] activity are being cast off. "Truth Will Prevail!"—this historical slogan has regained its original meaning, a meaning not perverted by dogmas. "Thanks to the students, thanks to the intelligentsia!"—the workers, who firmly support the country's renewal, are chanting.

A sharp political struggle for power, for leadership positions, and for society's trust has developed at this historic crossroads. The Communist Party is experiencing a crisis, and the initiative has been captured by "Civic Forum," which is scoring points with each passing day. Major cadre reshuffles have been carried out at two extraordinary CPCZ Central Committee plenums. The leaders who had been at the helm of power for 2 decades after the brief thaw of the "Prague Spring" have resigned. Now it is hard to find outstanding leaders in the party capable of giving a lead to Communists. The latest Central Committee plenums have shown what hard task is now facing Karel Urbanek, the 48-year-old new general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

One would like to believe that the situation is not so hopeless and that not everything has been lost yet. The Communist Party has experience and powerful arguments, but so far it lacks a clear-cut program for overcoming the crisis. The situation may radically change during the 2 months remaining until the congress, and it will be necessary to make up for decades rather than years.

The opposition, in the shape of "Civic Forum," which unites various organizations and groupings, including some of an antisocialist nature, is dictating the course of events. This was especially noticeable at Sunday's rally in Prague, when the rally organizers did not allow representatives of CPCZ party organizations to get to the microphones, citing as an explanation the rally program drawn up in advance. They were unwilling to engage in dialogue, although they swear that they demand dialogue. The result was a monologue. It was shrill, like the shout of people who have not been allowed to express themselves in public for years. Nonetheless, as the newspaper SVOBODNE SLOVO remarked, the very first lesson in the school of democracy is that both sides must be heard.

Every hour brings fresh reports reflecting the latest Czechoslovak events. A Marxist intelligentsia club was established yesterday on the basis of the weekly TRIBUNA. "Civic Forum" has published its program for emerging from the "moral, spiritual, ecological, economic, and political crisis."

Deputies Want 1968 Invasion of CSSR Condemned

AU2711134789 Paris AFP in English 1306 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Rome, Nov 27 (AFP)—Freedom of choice is one of the "primary principles" of Soviet foreign policy, a Kremlin spokesman said here Monday, in response to the momentous changes within the Soviet bloc.

Four Soviet deputies meanwhile called for the Soviet parliament to adopt a resolution condemning the 1968 Soviet-led military intervention in Czechoslovakia.

The deputy head of the Central Committee's International Department, Andrey Krachev, made his statement at a news briefing, asked whether the events in Czechoslovakia meant that Moscow was prepared to allow Prague to decide its own future independently.

"The Soviet leadership solemnly declares freedom of choice as one of the primary principles of foreign policy," he said.

"It applies to ourselves, as well as to all our partners" in the Soviet bloc, he said.

"This position has no limits or reservations, and I do not see what particular aspect could influence our position in this domain, be it what is happening in Poland, or East Germany or any other Socialist country"

The Soviet deputies at the news briefing, also in response to questions, said that they would vote in favour of a parliamentary resolution condemning the 1968 Soviet-led military intervention in Czechoslovakia.

Soviet officials have until now refused to officially condemn the 1968 events.

But the parliaments of Poland and Hungary have adopted resolutions condemning the intervention, which crushed the political liberalisation that has been compared to the current reforms known as perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

Sergey Alekseyev, head of a Soviet parliamentary committee, said that in his personal opinion "it is time to adopt such a resolution" condemning the 1968 military intervention.

Three other deputies present also said they would support such a motion. Academician Konstantin Frolov called for a resolution to be put on the Supreme Soviet's agenda.

Czechoslovak leader Milos Jakes, who was involved in the 1968 crushing of the Prague Spring was replaced last week along with other hardline officials.

GDR Moves Against Speculation Reported

PM2711141989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent S. Baygarov report: "GDR: Government Measures"]

[Text] Berlin, 23 Nov—A session of the GDR Council of Ministers held in Berlin today examined questions connected with the preparation of a whole package of draft laws regulating life inside the country. A draft law on foreign travel will also be prepared and, after ratification by the People's Chamber, will enshrine the right of every citizen of the republic to freedom of movement.

There was another item on the agenda related to measures aimed at mitigating the adverse consequences of the opening of the border on the evening of 9 November. That was a courageous political step by the GDR leadership, as a result of which the flow of illegal emigrants to the FRG dried up almost immediately. Now some of those people who left the GDR are returning.

However, this decision, taken in haste and under pressure of circumstances, has created a number of problems not only for the GDR but for the FRG, too. Overt speculation has flourished. People have begun taking durable goods and high-quality foodstuffs, which are cheaper in the GDR, out of the country for sale abroad. The long-forgotten waiting lines have appeared in front of the stores again. The illegal outflow of money is growing.

At yesterday's meeting between Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and working people of the Bergmann-Borsig enterprise in Berlin, the workers resolutely demanded that the national economy be protected against speculators and dealers in contraband.

So the Council of Ministers session has taken steps. The GDR Customs Service is being reinforced. As of today most goods, including many food products, will be sold only to citizens of the GDR and foreigners permanently resident or employed on the country's territory on presentation of their passport or identification documents. And, finally, deviation from the transit routes between Poland and West Berlin and Poland and the FRG is prohibited.

Further on Antispeculation Measures

PM2711141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov: "Enforced Measure"]

[Text] Berlin—A new procedure has been introduced in the GDR: A customer in a store can be asked for a document confirming whether he is a citizen of that country or a foreigner who is here on a long tour of duty—a worker, diplomat, foreign trade organization representative, journalist, someone with the relevant certification of identity issued by GDR official organs. Actually, he does not have to be asked, only if he is acquiring goods in large quantities, especially goods in short supply.

The new measures are being carried out at the decision of the republic's Council of Ministers. They are aimed primarily against those who have made speculation their trade. H. Modrow, the head of government, has said that the measures may prove unpopular. But the majority of GDR citizens have been thinking with alarm for several weeks now about how to stop the "selling off of the country."

The "start-up mechanism" for speculation lies in the currency black market existing in the FRG and West Berlin. As is well known, the GDR mark is not convertible. Its export abroad is forbidden. But exchange bureaus in the West buy and sell GDR paper money, regarding it as a commodity whose value is determined not by its real purchasing power, but by supply and demand at a given moment.

As a result, the illegal "exchange rate," which is formed according to market laws, does not work in favor of the GDR mark. It is 10:1 against the FRG mark and sometimes even fluctuates to 20:1. In practice that means that by exchanging FRG marks at this rate you can acquire goods in the GDR for a song and then resell them in the West. The West German marks thus obtained go back to the exchange bureau, turning into large sums of GDR marks... Goods from the GDR flow to the West and the store shelves are empty.

Another part of the "start-up mechanism" consists in the prices policy pursued by the former GDR leadership. Low prices that did not cover their prime cost were retained for a number of goods, for instance basic foods and children's clothing and shoes. The state paid for the sometimes very great difference in the form of subsidies to enterprises. Debates about how expedient state subsidies are in this form and whether it would not be better—by bringing prices into line with production expenses—at the same time to increase wages, pensions, grants, and monthly payments for children have taken place in the GDR before. They have now erupted with new force.

The point is that since the GDR opened free exits to the West for its citizens the problem of "selling off" has acquired additional acuteness. It has been calculated that the speculative outflow of goods from the GDR market totals 2.5 billion marks in retail prices this year, and if you add on the subsidy the figure is 3.5-4 billion marks.

Everyone in the East and the West understood that the resolute step by the GDR Government, which had opened its borders to free travel, should not result in an economic catastrophe for the country or the emptying of its stores. The measures that have now been taken are entirely justified. They were welcomed with approval both in the GDR and beyond its borders. In particular, West Berlin's governing mayor, W. Momper, responded to them positively.

The measures introduced by the GDR Government are varied. Customs control is being stepped up and there is an increase in the numerical strength of the customs service. As has already been stated, a number of goods will be sold only upon presentation of documents. Employees of the internal affairs ministry and the workers and peasants inspectorate and customs services will be on duty in those trade institutions where the influx of foreign citizens is particularly great. Routes from which deviation is forbidden have been established for transit from the Eastern border of the GDR to the FRG or West Berlin. Nor are transit passengers travelling this route by train allowed to break off their journey en route.

Lists of goods which it is forbidden to take abroad have been published. They include, for instance, meat, footwear, children's clothing, bed linen, spices, sugar, washing machines, wallpaper, and porcelain of a number of well-known makes.

The new ruling also applies to the servicemen of Western powers based in West Berlin, who have so far been able to make purchases unimpeded in the GDR capital, having exchanged FRG marks for GDR marks at a speculative rate beforehand.

Commenting on the problems the GDR has encountered and on possible paths for their further development, the press here points out that the introduction of a convertible mark would be most radical. But the path to the convertibility of an internal currency is not simple. It is complicated by the fact that, as the newspapers write, the country's pure foreign debt in hard currency is now $10 billion. This can only be gotten rid of gradually by increasing the competitiveness of GDR goods on the world market and increasing exports.

E. Berlin Police Prevent 'Chaos' at Wall

PM2311111589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Roundup of reports by TASS and APN correspondent Yu. Shlakov: "GDR: Time of Changes"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted]

Border Crossing Point at the Brandenburg Gate

The swiftness of the political and economic changes in the GDR demand equally rapid perestroyka in the various social and state institutions and faces them with new tasks. How is the renewal process proceeding in the GDR people's police, and what problems are the republic's guardians of order resolving today? Lieutenant General Friedhelm Rausch, president of the Berlin people's police, explains:

Indeed, the people's police has a far greater workload and new tasks that have appeared in connection with the adoption of a whole series of new laws. For example, it was thanks to the efficient work of our subunits that we were able to avoid chaos at the Berlin Wall when, to use the now accepted expression, "all the sluices" were opened into West Berlin. It is difficult to imagine, but we were able to cope with the avalanche of 60,000 cars and over 2 million pedestrians arriving at the city's checkpoints, I stress, by using civilized means, without using "special equipment."

This flow is not abating to this day, but it has been possible to spread it out by opening over 20 new checkpoints in the GDR capital. We intend to open a border point at the Brandenburg Gate soon. I don't think it is necessary to explain what this symbolizes for Berlin. Restraining the mass over-excitement surrounding this event is another of our tasks.

Business contacts were established recently with my West Berlin colleague—the president of the police force, Mr. Schatz. Direct telephone and radio links have been set up and an exchange of important operational information is being carried out. Our police forces are very anxious about the continuing outbreaks of hooliganism, particularly those committed by adolescents and young people who are trying to break off parts of the wall, some because they want souvenirs, and others to speed up the process of its destruction. We are also expecting a great deal of trouble in the next few weeks in connection with possible "outings" of rockers from West Berlin. The point is that cyclists and motorcyclists were recently permitted to enter the capital of the GDR.

Of course, opening the borders with West Berlin will entail a certain growth in crime, drug addiction, and prostitution, all of which were not a serious problem here before. Now our work is directed at putting a stop to and preventing these phenomena, as well as "black market" activities, which will also inevitably appear, or more precisely be revived, when the border is opened.

Students Demand Greater Independence

GDR students have been demanding more rapid perestroyka in the higher education system. Many thousands of representatives of young people at higher education institutes from all corners of the country took part in a demonstration in the center of the capital.

Speakers at the rally advocated giving greater independence to students. The demand that was made most vociferously was to repeal the right of the Free German Youth Union [FDJ] to sole representation of all the country's young men and women; the formation of independent student groups in the GDR, the speakers stressed, has created competition for the FDJ. They condemned the existing practice whereby representatives of these groups have been labelled antisocialist and counterrevolutionary elements. The speakers also demanded that empty apartments be put at the students' disposal and a living wage be paid to them. A number of speakers called for military training to be repealed in institutes of higher education and spoke in favor of creating greater opportunities for revealing students' individual abilities.

Around 200 schoolchildren staged a demonstration for peace and friendship between peoples. They carried through the checkpoint into West Berlin and back a banner 800 meters long bearing appeals reflecting their stance.

Professor S. Schwanke, acting GDR minister of higher education, spoke to the participants in the demonstration about the basic directions in the reform of the higher education system which is being prepared.

GDR Premier Thanks USSR Council of Ministers

PM2811103989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Message of thanks from GDR Premier Modrow to USSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] To the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades,

Sincere thanks for the cordial congratulations on my election as chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

The GDR Government regards the strengthening of the alliance between our two countries as a priority task. We will strive to give comprehensive cooperation with the USSR a new quality.

In anticipation of an early meeting, I wholeheartedly wish you great success in implementing the perestroyka policy aimed at renewing socialism in your country, and also creative strength and prosperity.

[Signed] Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers

Preliminary Results of Hungarian Referendum

LD2711153489 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Budapest November 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Sergey Ivanov:

Preliminary results of the November 26 Hungarian referendum, initiated by the Union of Free Democrats and the Union of Young Democrats, have been published here.

The electorate was invited to answer four questions: Should the president of the republic be elected only after parliamentary elections? Should the party vacate enterprises? Should the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party account for the property it owns? Should the Workers' Militia be disbanded?

According to initial results, 4,206,784 people out of the total number of 7,853,962 Hungarian voters (53.6 percent) have turned out for the referendum.

Preliminary data furnished by the central election commission shows that 53.7 percent of voters answered "no" to the first question and 46.3 percent—"yes". A positive reply to all the other questions was given by 95.4 percent of those polled.

Assessing the referendum's preliminary results, Imre Mecz, representative of the Union of Free Democrats, said in an interview with a correspondent of the Hungarian news service that half the country's voters' participation in the referendum testified to the union's victory, because there were calls to boycott it.

Bela Fabri, member of the Presidium of the Hungarian Socialist Party, noted that the referendum proceeded smoothly and showed that such polls contributed to the strengthening of confidence. At the same time, the fact that a part of the electorate did not go to the polls showed that the referendum was superfluous at the given juncture. It did not contribute to a peaceful transition.

"Irrespective of the results of the referendum, the Hungarian Socialist Party will insist that the country's president be elected by general ballot," he said.

"The Hungarian Democratic Forum does not regard as its defeat the fact that its boycott call was futile," Istvan Csurka, member of the Presidium of the Hungarian Democratic Forum, stressed in a brief interview with a correspondent of the Hungarian news service.

"There are no real winners or losers today. The most important thing for the Hungarian Democratic Forum today is to concentrate all efforts on the elections. The Hungarian Democratic Forum wants the free elections to be held on March 11 this year," he said.

More detailed results of the referendum will be announced later in the day and the official returns—on Tuesday.

Hungary's MSZP Facing Growing Opposition

90UI0129A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Nov 89 p 3

[Article by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent Yu. Savin and TASS correspondent A. Saliyev in Budapest: "A Time of Important Decisions"]

[Text] November plucks the last leaves from the trees. At times it gladdens one with sunny weather, at times it drizzles, and at times it covers car windows with a silver frost toward morning. In a word, as autumns go, it is a normal autumn in Hungary. Not much change in the appearance of the streets of Budapest, with its endless stream of vehicles and a mass of hurrying pedestrians. And with stores filled with various commodities, whose prices are invariably increasing.

It seems they are getting accustomed here to the recent sharply increasing tempo of sociopolitical life. Just as they are getting used to the fact that days off, which were previously considered to be a time for rest, are now also used for political matters. On Saturday and Sunday various parties and movements conduct congresses, gatherings, and meetings. A struggle is going on for the minds and sympathy of the population, programs are being developed, and complicated organizational questions are being resolved.

The formation of the ranks of the Hungarian Socialist Party is occurring in a conflicting, turbulent situation. Its numbers are not growing as fast as had been expected at first. It is believed that of the more than 700,000 members of the MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party] counted 1 and ½ months ago, up until now about 3 to 4 percent have gone over to its successor, the MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party].

We spoke at length with Shandor Sili, a member of the Presidium of the MSZP, a lathe operator in the Budapest plant "Veresh Chilog" (Red Star), about the reasons for the situation. He noted a certain interference by a segment of the members of the party in connection with the unusual nature of the past congress. For some, the current measures of the Party are insufficiently resolute, and others fear putting the cart before the horse. Also having an effect is the fact that a majority of the people who joined the current leadership of the party do not have political preparation, performing party duties on a social basis along with their main work.

In the opinion of our interlocutor, the main task now, under conditions of aggressive activity by the opposition parties and the current difficult economic position of the country, is to convince the common people that the MSZP is defending their interests. It is important to formulate specific positions more quickly on problems that trouble society.

In response to the question as to whether the MSZP will let the rural workers fall under the sphere of influence of other political forces, S. Sili replied:

"Of course not. An intense discussion is going on now about the Modern Agrarian Political Party. It is still early to speak about its exact make-up, but I think that at least three principles are mandatory: Normal wholesale prices are needed for agricultural products; within the framework of perfecting the economic mechanism, it is necessary to get rid of intermediary organizations, which only increase the losses of the agrarians; finally, a large part of the profits created by agricultural workers must remain under their control."

The political situation in the country unquestionably is also affected by the fact that many continue to consider themselves members of the MSZMP. Former organizations of this party are being recreated. And at the end of October, a meeting of active members of the MSZMP was held at one of the enterprises in Budapest in which Fryges Pugja, the former Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, announced that the main reason for the current political problems of the country is the haste in implementing reforms of the system of political institutions. He emphasized that democracy is possible even under a one-party system, and that a dictatorship can exist in a multiparty system as well. A temporary party leadership was elected at the activist meeting. It is proposed to hold an MSZMP congress by the end of the year.

More and more new opposition parties are entering the political arena whose political programs include positions that reflect ultraleft views, and also frank appeals for the restoration of a capitalist society. They number more than a dozen and a half.

The most influential that can be named now is the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDS], which accounted for the victory in intermediate elections of several deputies to the country's parliament. The MDS is for the creation of a law-governed and independent state, for the gradual transfer of inefficient state enterprises to the private sector, and for a strengthening of local self-government. This party intends to establish goodneighborly relations with the East and the West, and it sees prospects for Hungary's achieving the status of a neutral country after the example of Austria or Finland.

The heat of political passions in the country has intensified in connection with the forthcoming elections of the president of the republic. I. Poszgay, an MSZP candidate, has launched his pre-election campaign. L. Fyur, a challenger from the MDS, has also joined in the campaign aggressively. The National People's Front, the Independent Party of Small Owners, and other organizations have nominated their own candidates to this responsible post. How the head of state should be elected will be stated by the Hungarians themselves on 26 November during the national referendum to be conducted by a decision of the State Assembly of the republic.

It must be said that the closing days of autumn were fruitful in the activity of the Hungarian Parliament. A number of important legislative acts were adopted. Among them are laws on elections, on exit from and entry into the country, on foreign passports, and on a working militia. The Hungarian state has received a new name—the Hungarian Republic. The law on the functioning and management of the activity of parties prohibits them from creating their own organizations at places of work and accepting financial assistance from state enterprises, and it made it obligatory to submit an annual statement of their financial activity.

Soon the parliament at a special session will examine questions of taxation and state duties, and it will hear information concerning the basic directions of economic policy for next year. In January the government will submit a draft law on such an important problem as the protection of public, collective, state, and cooperative property in land.

The process of reorganization also affects public organization. Thus, at a recent plenum of Hungarian trade unions, a decision was made concerning the organization of new management organs. There was talk about plans in the near future to reduce the number of regional managerial staffs by 70-80 percent. It was emphasized that social policy should be directed at the removal of social tensions by way of increasing national income and domestic consumption. And at a meeting held the other day of managers of trade unions and the government, the further delay of economic restructuring of the country was declared unacceptable....

In a word, the increase in the activity of political and social forces in our neighboring fraternal country is evident. It is unlikely that anyone today would dare to predict what will be the end result of these forces that are frequently headed in very different directions. But it is clear that the future will depend on the correctness of and the consideration given to today's difficult decisions. And as was said by F. Killai, one of the deputies of the Hungarian parliament, the main thing is that the one-party system not be reduced to the single combat of various parties for power, but that it serve the interests of the nation and the interests of the people.

Hungary-USSR Trade Imbalance Viewed

90UI0083A Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Oct 89 p 3

[Report on interview with Y. Ambrush, trade representative of the Republic of Hungary to the USSR, and I. Panteleyev, chief of the Main Administration for Economic Ties with CEMA Member Nations and Yugoslavia at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, by TRUD correspondent A. Vinogradskiy: "The Trade Imbalance Between Hungary and the USSR"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Hungary is our reliable partner of longstanding in the sphere of foreign trade. However, our recent trade contacts have begun to show some rather serious problems. Who is to blame for these problems? It would be somewhat complicated to respond definitively to this question. We therefore decided to allow both the Hungarian and Soviet parties to present their views. First Y. Ambrush, trade representative of the Republic of Hungary to the USSR, answers questions posed by our correspondent, A. Vinogradskiy.

[Vinogradskiy] The question of trade imbalance has critically presented itself today before the Soviet Union and Hungary. To what degree does this problem interfere with the further development of our cooperation in the economic sphere?

[Ambrush] Yes, the deficit problem has become quite critical over the past 2 years. Judge for yourself. Total volume of trade this year between Hungary and the USSR comes to R8.7 billion (the reference here and throughout is to convertible rubles, in which foreign trade among the socialist countries is measured—Ed.). But the balance of payments for the end of September of this year amounted to R600 million in Hungary's favor. In addition to trade volume, this figure includes various services and nontrade operations. In tourism, for example, we have a favorable balance of R80 million, which exceeds the planned level by 50 million. And naturally, all of this interferes with the further expansion of mutually beneficial ties. Thus, Hungarian exports to the USSR since 1988 have been reduced by approximately 12 percent. We are presently attempting, along with the Soviet side, to balance the cost of reciprocal deliveries and services.

Following conclusion of the trade protocol for 1989, the Soviet side was supposed to provide Hungary a volume of goods in excess of the planned export volume from the USSR. But this did not come about because Soviet trade partners often refuse to accept rubles in payment—they ask for freely convertible currency or propose barter deals, i.e., reciprocal deliveries of goods.

Moreover, the Soviet Union is presently unable to provide the planned deliveries of all items. And therefore, unfortunately, many Hungarian firms are today required to suspend conclusion of contracts for exporting their products to your country, because the USSR cannot cover their cost. The famous "Icarus" plant which produces buses got into this predicament, for example. This year it will hold back delivery to the Soviet Union of about a thousand vehicles for the above-mentioned reason...

In spite of these temporary difficulties, we are trying to develop our cooperation. Today our representation amounts to 100 Hungarian firms in the Soviet Union. These are prepared to expand business contacts and conclude new agreements for delivery of goods in excess of plan on a balanced basis. We are confident that the Soviet consumer will be pleased to acquire these products. There is a fundamental difficulty, however, in what the Hungarian side can obtain in return.

[Vinogradskiy] What is the volume today of Hungarian exports to our country?

[Ambrush] Right now the volume of exports from Hungary to the USSR is estimated at approximately R4.2 billion. About half of the total exports consist of deliveries of various instruments, machinery and equipment, a portion of which is specially drawn up on the order of Soviet consumers. The Soviet Union also receives deliveries from us of grain, meat products, fresh and canned fruits and vegetables, consumer goods, ready-made garments, knitwear, pesticides, medical equipment and medicines, buses, and much more.

[Vinogradskiy] And what does Hungary receive from the USSR?

[Ambrush] Mainly raw materials, such as gas, oil, timber, and metals. We also import paper, cellulose, machine-building equipment. Still, priority is given to purchases of raw materials, which comprise 85% of total import volume. But this does not at all mean that Hungarian firms will not purchase finished articles from you when they have the opportunity—but only when these are quality goods. Nor is the Hungarian side indifferent to the quantity of goods which our Soviet partners can offer us.

For example, our country could import a far greater number of cars. But there are problems here, unfortunately. Let us consider the Volga Automobile Plant—up until now it has not concluded contracts for delivering 8,000 vehicles to us as planned. The Tolyatti plant explains this by the fact that, in spite of the state requisition, it is not in a position to completely provide the quantity of vehicles which is stipulated in the protocol on trade and payments for this year. This kind of incomplete delivery has an appreciable effect as well on Hungary's domestic market.

[Vinogradskiy] Many Soviet enterprises today have acquired the opportunity to engage directly in trade with respect to their products. Does this help in developing trade relations between our countries?

[Ambrush] Without a doubt. In 1989 the volume of such direct trade, not stipulated in the protocol, amounted to over R250 million. Hungarian firms are gladly pursuing direct contacts, including contacts with cooperatives.

I hope this interview will make our position regarding trade with the Soviet Union clear to TRUD's readers. I would also like to stress that, as before, Hungary is ready to cooperate with your country, our main partner in trade.

[Vinogradskiy] Now we consider the comments of I. Panteleyev, chief of the Main Administration for Economic Ties with CEMA Member Nations and Yugoslavia of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Ties.

[Panteleyev] In his interview, my Hungarian colleague emphasizes the most important aspects of our cooperation. True, not everything in what he says can go without argument.

The Soviet Union occupies a prominent position in satisfying the needs of its neighbor for basic fuel and raw materials, as well as certain varieties of machine-building products. The large USSR domestic market enables Hungarian enterprises to effect steady sales of its products and creates favorable conditions for production activity.

It should be taken into account, however, that since the mid-1980's, prices of energy sources delivered to Hungary have decreased under the influence of world market prices. This has led to a reduction in the value of our exports. Typically, the physical volume of Soviet goods has not decreased, and has even grown for certain production varieties, but for the time being, we are unable to compensate fully for such a significant reduction in export revenues by accelerating our shipments to

Hungary, due to limited resources. It is also possible to reduce our purchases in Hungary to certain limits. As a result, the mutual balance of trade is turning out to be unfavorable for the Soviet side.

Measures are presently being undertaken to reduce the imbalance. Soviet and Hungarian foreign trade and industrial enterprises are directing their basic attention primarily at fulfilling their obligations regarding concluded contracts, eliminating the lag in product deliveries, and seeking to establish goods for reciprocal delivery above agreed volumes.

Expanding our technological assistance in construction and reconstruction projects in Hungary can have an effect on decreasing the negative trade balance. Appropriate USSR proposals are presently being worked out by involved organizations of both sides.

In looking at problems regarding the trade balance, it should be kept in mind that the Soviet Union's debts to Hungary arose from current dealings. On the other hand, Hungary is also indebted to us, but in credits extended to it previously. A certain portion of the payments for these credits goes outside the framework of the current 5-year plan. It would now be possible to draw up a reciprocal accounting of our obligations.

We feel that the economic reforms underway in our countries are creating the basis for perfecting our approaches to mutual cooperation. In this regard, we do not preclude the possibility of changing to trade accounting in terms of freely convertible currency.

RCP Congress Ends; Nicu Ceausescu Cited

PM2811092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Romania: Program Documents Adopted"]

[Text] Bucharest—The 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress has ended in the capital's Palace of the Republic.

The capital, festooned with slogans, banners, and portraits of Nicolae and Elena Ceausescu, followed the congress' work for 5 days. The congress began with a report by General Secretary N. Ceausescu and continued at plenary sittings and sections whose work, according to the Romanian press, proceeded under the sign of the ideas contained in the report. In all, 554 delegates spoke, noting successes in the political, socioeconomic, scientific, and technical spheres and also criticizing certain shortcomings and omissions in work.

"The cardinal report by the party general secretary, which contains a brilliant analysis of the glorious path we have traveled in building the new society and fundamental, perspicacious, and strategic guidelines for Romania's socioeconomic development, is a document of outstanding theoretical and practical value," Nicu Ceausescu, delegate from Sibiu Judet, noted at the congress.

Speakers paid special attention to problems of the contemporary international situation and disarmament questions. Proceeding from the report's tenets, they noted the stepping up of attempts by imperialist forces to destabilize the socialist countries by distancing the party leadership from the solution of economic problems and sharply criticized the model of "market socialism" and the deideologization of international relations as "disorienting the masses."

"It is important to annul all agreements concluded with Hitler's Germany and to eliminate all their consequences," it was said in the congress hall. It was this part of the report, to which delegates kept coming back at plenary sittings, that produced the most pointed questions at a press conference held in the "Intercontinental" Hotel.

But let us return to the congress hall, where speakers were repeatedly interrupted by tumultuous applause by delegates chanting: "Ceausescu and the people!"

By the end of the 4th day's work, delegates adopted the program documents. They unanimously approved the directive program for Romania's socioeconomic development during the Ninth 5-Year Plan and in the long term through 2000-2010 and the general secretary's report to the RCP Central Committee October Plenum "On Problems of Socialism and on Ideological and Educational Activity To Develop Revolutionary Awareness and To Shape the New Man, Conscientious Builder of Socialism and Communism in Romania" as the RCP's ideological program until the 15th party congress.

On its final day the congress unanimously ratified the RCP Central Committee Plenum's recommendation that Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu be reelected general secretary of the RCP. N. Ceausescu has headed the RCP since 1965.

Vorotnikov Visits Romanian Farm Equipment Exhibit

PM2711150189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Visit to Exhibition"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is taking part in the work of the 14th Romanian Communist Party Congress, visited an exhibition of agricultural equipment yesterday.

The guests inspected new grain harvesting and potato harvesting combines, multifunctional tractors, soil processing equipment, seed drills, and other equipment produced by Romanian industry. At a design and engineering technology research laboratory specialists spoke of their plans for cooperation with Soviet enterprises. It was emphasized that Romanian industry supplies many countries, including the Soviet Union, with agricultural equipment.

Agricultural machine building initiated Romanian-Soviet cooperation. The first Romanian tractors and combines were produced under Soviet licenses. The foundations of contemporary Romanian agricultural machine building were laid with technical assistance from the USSR and other socialist countries.

V.I. Vorotnikov advocated the further deepening of cooperation between Soviet and Romanian agricultural machine building enterprises and the broadening of cooperation in this sphere.

V.I. Vorotnikov had a meeting yesterday with staff from the embassy and Soviet establishments in Romania.

Yugoslav Communists' Need for Unity Noted

PM2711124189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent Ye. Fadeyev: "Acquiring Unity"]

[Text] Belgrade—A little less than 2 months remain until the 14th (Extraordinary) League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY] Congress. Party conferences have already been held in the autonomous provinces within the framework of its preparation. On Friday the ninth conference of the LCY organization in the Yugoslav People's Army ended, in the course of which there was an examination of the army communists' tasks in the light of the political and economic reforms being carried out in the country. The conference participants adopted a program of ideological-political tasks for the LCY organization in the Yugoslav People's Army that expresses support for the LCY course toward the country's further development along a socialist path and the implementation of transformations in society. Vice Admiral P. Simic was elected chairman of the LCY Committee in the Yugoslav People's Army. And on 25 November the 10th Congress of the League of Communists of Macedonia began work in Skopje.

The forthcoming forum is unusual if only because it is the first extraordinary one to be announced in the 70-year history of the Yugoslav communists' party.

Previous conferences have confirmed what was clear even before they started: There is no unity and there are contradictory opinions in the supreme party leadership on a number of key issues. This was also reflected in the mass media. The popular newspaper POLITIKA, assessing the results of the provincial party conferences, wrote: "For the LCY to emerge from the crisis it needs a unified and precise program of actions." The opinion of VECERNJE NOVOSTI is even more categorical: "We must engage in preparation for the congress without reciprocal threats and accusations."

Moreover, S. Korosec, secretary of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, said in an interview with TANJUG that in the LCY leadership individual leaders have directly opposite stances on a number of elements. He also noted that today the party members are demanding the LCY's speediest adaptation to social conditions and are particularly insisting on the deepening of the processes of democratization in the party and country.

The press notes that the program documents of the republican and provincial organizations reflect important differences in position, so that it is sometimes even difficult to speak of a united and integrated party. At the same time these documents, observers note, contain what unites the party organizations: the orientation toward implementing social reforms. Although it is obvious to many people in the country that the planned reforms will proceed far more successfully if they are implemented in different republics and provinces by different ways and means in accordance with existing specific features.

Local observers note that it is now impossible to achieve unity by any command methods, pressure from above, or mere voting in the LCY Central Committee and the imposition of one's own opinions. Yet unity is extremely necessary. The weekly KOMMUNIST believes this to be a fateful question. In an editorial it asks: "Does the LCY want to leave the political stage forever? Does the LCY want to fall apart and become one of the more or less equal parties in the SFRY's democratic system?" To avoid this happening, the weekly notes, the speediest reform of the LCY is needed; it is necessary to return to the party as rapidly as possible its prestige in Yugoslav society.

The LCY conferences have said a lot and the republican congresses will say a lot. I shall recall one typical demand on the party which is now being heard in the country. For the successful implementation of reforms immediate cadre changes are needed, as is the promotion to the fore of young, capable, vigorous people whose thoughts and deeds are entirely directed into the future. If this does not happen, the dynamism of the reforming processes will be called to question in the SFRY.

Yet so far, with not that much time left until the LCY congress, there is no precise position in the party on many questions. "It must be noted," TANJUG writes, "that the LCY often does not have the necessary orientation. And it is pitching like a 'paper boat' on the waves of the crisis in its own ranks and in society as a whole."

Yes, the Yugoslav Communists have many problems right now. Mounting the congress rostrum with a precise, principled, political program on the key questions of social and state restructuring—that is the paramount task facing the LCY.

Naturally, the course of debate and the communists' mood manifested in the period of preparation for the 14th (Extraordinary) LCY Congress—particularly at forums like the one which has now begun in Skopje—are generating enormous interest in Yugoslavia (and indeed abroad).

Ryzhkov Condolences Over SFRY Mining Disaster

LD2111095989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has sent sincere condolences to Ante Markovic, president of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia, on the occasion of the disaster at Morava colliery involving human casualties. He expressed sympathy to the families and loved ones of those who were killed. [passage omitted]

Aboimov Receives Bulgarian Envoy 23 Nov

PM2711153789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.P. Aboimov received G. Pankov, Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR, 23 November. They discussed the prospects for further improving Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in foreign policy.

West Europe

East Bloc Changes Impact on Malta Meeting Viewed

PM2711202989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov commentary under the "Political Observer's Opinion" rubric: "History Itself Is on the Agenda. En Route for the Shores of Malta"]

[Text] No matter how interesting the just-beginning visit of M.S. Gorbachev to Italy is, observers are already looking beyond it to the end of this week, to the shores of romantic Malta where the Soviet-U.S. summit is to be held; although an unofficial summit, it is the first with this lineup and undoubtedly a very important one in the current international atmosphere. Shortly after the announcement of this meeting I already had occasion to write that the speed of change was dictating the pace for the two world leaders and forcing them to meet, ahead of schedule, 6 months before the official meeting arranged earlier (see IZVESTIYA No. 310). Since then events have moved on even faster, and even those analysts who like to strike the pose of prophets are admitting with uncommon simplicity: Who would have thought it?! Who could have imagined this?!

Who could have imagined that the Berlin Wall, which for 28 years stood as the material embodiment of Churchill's "iron curtain" metaphor, would suddenly, following a decision by the new GDR leadership, become not a demarcation line but a place where West and East Berliners would meet? Hundreds of thousands of people are now freely crossing the open border where formerly isolated desperate characters, risking their lives, tried to flee to the West, and virtually all of them are returning home, thus corroborating a truth rejected by totalitarian regimes, but used by democratic regimes as the basis of their existence, the truth that when people have freedom of movement across borders, the overwhelming majority choose to stay at home, especially if they have been provided with the opportunity to freely reshape and improve their lives—at home! For the old GDR leadership the opening of the wall was unthinkable, for the new leadership it became indispensable because there was no other way to stabilize the political situation in the GDR, discounting the unacceptable alternative of the use of violence against one's own people.

The wall which has become a gate thrown wide open symbolizes the changes in Eastern Europe just as the debate at the first Congress of People's Deputies which was open to the whole world symbolized the determined nature of perestroyka in the USSR. The change of leadership in Bulgaria and the mass demonstrations denouncing T. Zhivkov... The expression of the people's will in Czechoslovakia and the collective resignation of the Czechslovak Communist Party leadership which was in power on the dubious mandate of August 1968... And all this has happened within 3 weeks of November in the year 1989 which has been unusually rich in, without exaggeration, cardinal, historic events.

They prove that perestroyka in the USSR has triggered a kind of chain reaction of the demolition of administrative edict systems also in the other socialist states where, just like in our country, the Stalinist and neo-Stalinist (Brezhnevite) models of socialism that have failed to prove themselves from the viewpoint of the people's needs and interests are just as hard to get rid of. Without pressure from Moscow, but undoubtedly under the impact of the Soviet example, a kind of synchronization of social processes is taking place whose main common denominator is the movement toward democracy and political pluralism. Just like there was previously a synchronization of stagnation.

It is true that the changes have come none too soon; it would be no bad thing to subtract two Brezhnevite decades from history, but alas history does not permit such arithmetic. On the other hand, the more the necessary changes are delayed, the greater the dizzying speed with which they take place, literally before our eyes, at this very moment. According to many analysts, since 1945 there has not been a more momentous year than 1989. How could the leaders of the two nuclear powers, which occupy the leading place in the two main military-political alliances into which Europe and the world is divided, not meet during this year?! History itself would not have forgiven them. Especially since wisdom, self-control, and a sense of balance are needed more than ever before given the abrupt twists and turns.

Talking recently in Washington to a well-informed fellow journalist, I was told: Before the wall came down, the unofficial meeting off Malta would have been "forgiven" for a minimum of content, it could have gotten away with "a mere" exchange of opinions, but the scale of the new shifts forces the U.S. side to actively seek some kind of practical result in order not to disappoint a sharply more attentive and expectant public. But what kind of result? My interlocutor ruled out any kind of declaration by the two sides which could be interpreted in the world and especially in Europe as a claim to some kind of U.S.-Soviet hegemony in Europe. Both sides will scrupulously try to avoid giving such an impression to the world. My interlocutor thought it possible that new proposals in the sphere of arms control might be submitted. Since then, however, President Bush has explained publicly that there will be no breakthrough in these questions, and that detailed talks on this score would be better postponed until the official Soviet-U.S. summit approximately in the middle of next year.

The Americans have clearly stepped up the preparations for the meeting but, as I was told by a Soviet diplomat in Washington, they are keeping their cards close to their chest. There are only hints. As regards the problem of regional conflicts, Washington, judging by these hints, will advocate that the "winds of change" blowing across Eastern Europe spread to Cuba and Nicaragua. Moscow is entitled to point out that the ossified U.S. stance in terms of aid to the "irreconcilables" is hampering the quest for a political settlement in Afghanistan on the basis of national reconciliation and, essentially, perpetuating the bloodshed from which innocent people suffer most.

Clearly, in one way or another, the question of economic cooperation will be raised. Without the resolute and rapid expansion of this cooperation, official U.S. declarations about practical assistance to the reforms in the USSR look increasingly like nothing but hot air. This is the opinion of a number of liberal-minded U.S. analysts with whom I have met in Washington and New York. An active and, of course, constructive U.S. stance is more and more insistently called for, and will be duly appreciated in light of the difficult situation in the Soviet consumer market, and especially the food supply situation.

However, let us return to the question of the rapid changes in Eastern Europe which, after Poland and Hungary, have taken place in the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. I was in the United States when, in political terms, the wall came down, and I saw what a major event and, of course, a sensation this was for the U.S. political establishment and for U.S. television. Posing during those days and nights against the backdrop of the graffiti-covered wall, which looked like a work of pop art, or against the Brandenburg Gate, leading commentators of all the main U.S. television networks organized a kind of "festival of freedom" lasting a whole week.

It must be said that the U.S. President, the secretary of state, and other high-ranking officials expressed their gratification in a considered manner, contained their emotions, and did not succumb to calls to yield to rejoicing on the occasion of "socialism's collapse" in yet another, strategically important country. Washington—just like official Bonn and other West European capitals, by the way—did not share the emotional rejoicing on the allegedly emerging preconditions for Germany's immediate reunification "based on" the FRG. On the contrary, the muted but nonetheless pretty definite theme to be heard in the official statements was that two German states, and also NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization—even if in a modified form—need to exist in the foreseeable future as guarantees of durable peace in Europe during these sharp turns in history.

But American anticommunists without official posts made no secret of their feeling—among other feelings—of malicious glee toward us. On the one hand, they gave Moscow due credit for its calmly benevolent attitude toward events, for its commitment—now being verified in action—to the principle of freedom of choice for all peoples and rejection of any—let alone armed—interference in the internal affairs of other states, including our allies. On the other hand, the crumbling of the wall was presented as a triumph for the years-long policy of American rigidity and strength, and the firm refusal by seven presidents (beginning with John Kennedy) to accept its existence. Even when paying lip service to Soviet policy, they describe the dramatic development of events as an historic victory by the West over the East, by the United States over the USSR. Describing the erection of the wall as "the most graphic admission of communism's moral bankruptcy," the well-known conservative observer George Will writes that its collapse is now "the symbol of communism's failure."

Our glasnost is yet again stumbling when analyzing the spirit of the breathtaking events in East Europe. But when we have overcome one more barrier of timidity and temporary dumbfoundedness we will have to admit that Will is right if "communism's failure" is taken to mean the failure of its Stalinist model which, alas—until quite recently and for rather a long time—was its only model.

Indeed, Moscow recognized and, moreover, supported the fact of the Berlin Wall's existence, following the GDR leadership and proceeding from the premise that a closed or strictly controlled border reinforced the most important postwar reality of the existence of two German states and prevented the GDR being bled dry. Indeed, none of the Soviet leaders (in contrast with U.S. presidents) called for the wall's demolition or the free movement of East Berliners to West Berlin until this became the official policy of the new GDR leadership. It must be admitted that this line, this position, failed to withstand the test of time and, as it emerged, the GDR population's support for it declined with the passage of time. In this respect the latest events can be perceived as the failure of attempts made over the years to hide behind the wall and create a more prosperous German state of the working people than in the West.

M.S. Gorbachev will be meeting George Bush, rather than George Will, on board the two cruisers. The tone of the conversation on the U.S. side will, of course, be different. But if the German moment of truth does start hovering above the table, it would also be appropriate to specify this: Which Soviet Union and which "communism" are meant? For which Soviet Union, the old one or the one undergoing renewal, is this story of the wall a defeat, and for which one is it almost a victory or, in any event, an inevitable development of new trends, like an East German echo of our own perestroyka? Apart from everything else, history is the history of doctrines and theories implemented and then accepted or rejected by the actual development of life. The supreme criterion whether a particular development is correct and whether a given path leads to a dead end is ultimately the people's living standard, the sensible organization of their labor and social existence, and the greatest possible opportunities for revealing the potential of human personality (in other words freedom restricted by law only as regards the infringement of other people's freedom). No matter how absolutely scientific doctrines and theories may appear to be, they are nothing but wishful thinking until they are tested in practice. It has long been known where, in the worst possible alternative, a path paved by wishful thinking can lead. In such an event it is very important to abandon it—sooner, or better later than never. When you abandon it, this is not so much a defeat but a sense of having found with difficulty and taken another path, maybe not as smooth and maybe not as brief, but a more correct one.

Amazed by Moscow's ability to keep up the initiative in East-West relations even in today's difficult circumstances, the other side's commentators describe this at times as the art of turning necessity into a virtue. There is no need to draw a distinction between things that are perfectly compatible. Poverty is no vice, and necessity does not preclude virtue. Especially if, in this process, Moscow is enlightening the West and teaching it a broader and more universal approach, and if this dispels the skepticism of the new U.S. President, who now says with utmost certainty: "America's wish is for President Gorbachev's reforms known as perestroyka to be crowned with success... for the Soviet Union, together with us, to move 'beyond the policy of deterrence' to a new partnership."

Ultimately, George Bush quite nicely formulated one of the objectives of the meeting off Malta's shores: "We will seek from President Gorbachev assurances that this process of reforms in East Europe will continue. We, for our part, will give him assurances that America welcomes the reforms not as a rival aiming for advantages, but as a people offering support."

If the words about support being offered are translated into deeds, Malta will help the implementation of the dialectical relationship between victory and defeat which was expressed by the childishly naive but simultaneously wise poet who wrote: "They have all defeated me, and therein lies my victory." He wrote this long before politicians had started talking about the interconnections of a new, single, interlinked world.

Shevardnadze Interviewed by L'UNITA Director

LD2511192389 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met Massimo d-Alema, member of the Italian Communist Party leadership and political director of the L'UNITA Italian newspaper, here on Saturday and answered his questions on current political trends in Europe and the world.

Shevardnadze gave the interview in the run-up to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy.

Shevardnadze stressed that the first ever visit by a Soviet leader to Italy will give a new boost to Soviet-Italian relations and will be a major event in the deepening of the common European process.

Adamishin on Aims of Gorbachev's Italy Visit

PM2711125089 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 24 Nov 89 p 13

[Interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin by Ezio Mauro; date, place not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[Introductory passage omitted] [Mauro] Minister Adamishin, what is Gorbachev seeking in his visit to Italy, between meetings with the pope and Bush?

[Adamishin] Gorbachev expects a very great deal from this state visit, which is in a way unprecedented. It is in fact the first time that a Soviet number one has visited Italy. There is the precedent of the visit by Nikolay Podgornyy in 1967, when he met also with Paul VI, but that was clearly different because Podgornyy, though chairman of the Supreme Soviet, was not the central figure of our state. But our expectations stem from our awareness of the role that Italy can perform in this period of major changes.

[Mauro] Are you talking about changes in East-West relations?

[Adamishin] Mainly these, yes. Thanks to the new climate that has come about between East and West there is now a specific possibility—perhaps unique in the history of the past 40 years—of finding a way out of the old world in order to enter a new period of development of international relations and of peace, thus ending the period of political and military contraposition. But this result is not to be taken for granted. It is a major opportunity that must be fully exploited, and for this to happen each of the parties involved must play its part. We believe that Italy is an important party. And we are well aware that we have always found a common language with Italy.

[Mauro] But there is another major change under way—that which is altering the political face of Eastern Europe. Italy will ask Gorbachev for an explicit pledge to support the processes of reform and democratization that have started in the Warsaw Pact countries. How will the general secretary reply?

[Adamishin] We are prepared for it, because we are very well aware that the European aspect is now inevitably the focus of Gorbachev's visit to Italy. It is inevitable because the current changes in the international situation are being felt mainly in Europe. This is where the movement is happening. And for us it is a positive movement—and we will say so—because it is bringing the two sides of Europe closer together. Our conception of the common home is precisely this: the elimination of divisions and an attempt by the two Europes to adapt to each other.

[Mauro] What role can Italy play, together with the other Western countries, in the events that are beginning in Europe?

[Adamishin] A considerable role. We are aware of the major role that Italy plays in Europe, and furthermore on European matters our experience of relations with Italy is very positive. We are sure that many points in common can be found. Then parallel action will also be possible with a view to an evolutionary transformation of the continent's present situation without dangerous wrenches or leaps. Gorbachev will seek this common language in Rome.

[Mauro] In Moscow a year ago the general secretary greeted Italian businessmen with a toast to capitalism. Will Italian-USSR economic cooperation proceed from that toast or has it moved ahead in the intervening months?

[Adamishin] That approach originated earlier, many years ago, and has developed into very diversified economic relations between our two countries. Italy has in fact played the role of the leading country in this field, and the industrial center at Togliattigrad is a historic and specific example of this leadership. Even now 50 percent of Soviet motorists drive cars manufactured in Togliattigrad. Now new negotiations are in progress between us and Fiat for another major contract for the manufacture of small-engined cars. But there is much more—agreements on commodities currently very important to us here in the USSR, namely, consumer goods and foodstuffs. All this promises to increase further and to progress, because a crucial factor exists in Italy: the desire to facilitate our life, not to create more problems for us.

[Mauro] The USSR rejects the rationale of aid from the West but requests support for perestroyka: What specifically can Italy do?

[Adamishin] I have always believed that those who want to help always find the ways and means to do so. But of course the first thing we need now in the USSR is an international climate that will facilitate the development of perestroyka. And there is no doubt that Italy can do a great deal to improve this climate, for instance by trying to accelerate the Vienna conventional disarmament negotiations. You say that we reject aid, but I would point out that what we want is not charity but cooperation. At present ordinary cooperation does not exist because technological and scientific relations are burdened by obsolete embargoes and bans.

[Mauro] As far as Gorbachev's USSR is concerned, is there an Italian specificity in the dialogue with Europe?

[Adamishin] There are several. Italy is a reliable political and economic partner, a country whose leadership class is wise, realistic, and constructive—certainly in international matters, though I do not know about domestic matters, because they are not my affair. For us Italy is also a bridge not only between North and South but also between the East and West of Europe. This very fact creates the need for consistent conduct. For instance, I wonder: Is it really necessary to bring the NATO fighter bombers from Spain to Italy? At this stage, when the trend is toward reduction, Italy's decision seems to me to conflict with the spirit of the times. Perestroyka and detente are supported, but when a relatively courageous gesture is needed, it fails to materialize.

[Mauro] How do you reply to the Italian objection that the missiles at Comiso contributed to the new Soviet arms reduction policy?

[Adamishin] I would reply that it is an old argument. The new policy was born thanks to perestroyka, not the missiles, and I believe that Italians know this by now.

Akhromeyev Discusses East Bloc Military Alliance

AU2211155089 Rome ANSA in English 1229 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, November 22—The Warsaw Pact will not crumble in the wake of radical changes sweeping Eastern Europe, according to Sergey Akhromeyev, military adviser to Kremlin chief Mikhail Gorbachev.

In an interview published Wednesday [22 November] in the Rome daily LA REPUBBLICA, Marshal Akhromeyev said today the Warsaw Pact countries are not united simply because there is an alliance, but because it is in the interest of each of those countries to be [word indistinct] in their military interest, but also in their political and economic interests.

Akhromeyev went on to say there would be change within the Eastern bloc military alliance which "will certainly have its ideological superstructure removed," but, he added, the Pact will continue to exist for a long time to come.

Commenting on Gorbachev's perestroyka (reconstruction) policies and the sudden wave of reform in many of the Soviet Union's Eastern bloc allies, the marshal said that the Soviet Armed Forces supported perestroyka, but could not back all the changes in the East without exception.

"We support the three basic principles: demilitarisation, democratisation, and de-ideologisation of international relations," Gorbachev's military adviser told the daily. "Between countries from now on the only thing that will count will be international law, and, naturally, the interests of each nation."

Akhromeyev went on to express his belief that perestroyka will bolster socialism in the East, rather than bringing it to an end as, he said, many Western nations expect.

Stressing the military's support for reform, the marshal said "We Soviet military leaders are Communists and patriots. We are convinced that perestroyka is the right way, so we support it and we will continue to do so."

Akhromeyev was not prepared, however, to condemn armed interventions in Budapest in 1956 and Prague in 1968. "It is not the right moment to criticise those measures," he told the Rome daily.

Gorbachev Adviser Cited on Rome, Malta Meetings

AU2211160489 Rome ANSA in English 1236 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] (ANSA) Turin, November 22—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will respond to changes sweeping the Eastern bloc by enhancing the independence of [word indistinct] nations, according to Yevgeniy Arbatsumov, an advisor to Gorbachev.

In an interview with the Turin daily LA STAMPA a week before Gorbachev's arrival in Rome for an official visit, Arbatsumov, an expert on Italian and Eastern European affairs, made predictions about what the Kremlin chief would discuss with his Italian hosts, and with United States President George Bush who he will meet immediately after his Italian trip.

According to the advisor, Gorbachev "will say that Moscow's approach to the reform process is not propagandistic, but strategic. He will confirm his plans to restructure relations with the Eastern bloc on the basis of authentic independence."

Arbatsumov will be accompanying Gorbachev to Italy, November 29- December 1, and for his Malta superpower summit, December 2-3.

A second comment may emerge from next week's meetings, Gorbachev's advisor went on: "The possibility of a joint stance by the superpowers on the on-going changes in the East."

A joint stance, he explained, would not mean merely picking up the bill for the reforms together, but guaranteeing the right kind of atmosphere in which they may flourish, without making any move which might compromise them.

Turning to the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the military alliances of the Eastern and Western blocs, Arbatsumov said that reforms in the political-military structures were important, and added that the ideological element in the Warsaw Pact would have to be reviewed. "This process," he said, "will certainly be much easier if NATO carries out a similar one simultaneously."

Asked about the situation in Romania and Czechoslovakia, where veteran hardliners are clinging on to power, Gorbachev's advisor told the Turin daily: "In Czechoslovakia, the regime is getting weaker. I think a repeat of East German events is imminent there. The regime cannot hang on for much longer, especially as alternatives have already presented themselves."

"In Romania," he continued, "the regime is much more repressive, more Asian, based on government by a clan, a totalitarian, fascistic family, and a (opposition) movement like the one growing up in Czechoslovakia cannot develop there."

Responding to a question on the alleged desire of some socialist countries to leave the Warsaw Pact, Arbatsumov said that no one would stand in their way.

"Nothing serious would happen," he said, "because the defence of the Soviet Union's borders is assured by Soviet forces."

Italian Foreign Minister Views Gorbachev Visit

LD2611095389 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—The forthcoming visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Italy will be held against the background of the East-West historic reconciliation, Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis writes in PRAVDA today.

The minister says tht the Italian-Soviet talks will centre on changes in Europe. Therefore, European integration will be their first item.

He believes that the visit by the Soviet leader to Italy is a chance for a big advance in economic cooperation through a series of agreements embracing both traditional spheres of cooperation—chemistry and the power industry—and new fields, including telecommunications.

The sides will sign a general declaration on the conversion of the military industry, the first of its kind on one of the main issues, on which the success of perestroyka is hinged, Michelis writes.

Using specific understandings, the sides should also initiate joint actions aimed at tackling the so-called all-penetrating problems: from narcotics to dangers looming over the earth which is our big common home, the minister continues.

In his opinion, the visit will make a turn in cultural exchanges by opening centres in the two capitals and the project of a European fund.

Last but not least, Michelis writes, the sides will improve mechanisms of agreeing issues at a political, parliamentary and military levels as well as between two societies, starting with contacts between the governments.

The sides will discuss eventually the question of raising the political level of bilateral relations in accordance with the directions of very important joint declarations, which will enable the sides to make a contribution to joint changes in 1990s, the minister noted.

Italians Eager for Upcoming Gorbachev Visit

PM2411153789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[A. Tarakanov dispatch: "Change of Season. Italy Prepares for Soviet Leader's Visit"]

[Excerpts] Rome, Nov—[Passage omitted] M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy is the main event of the year that is ending. This has been noted by the country's statesmen, politicians, and public figures. Italian Foreign Minister Gianni De Michelis believes that the upcoming Soviet-Italian summit talks will raise the relations between the two countries to a qualitatively new level and will facilitate the expansion of mutually advantageous ties in the sphere of politics, economy, and culture. Italy supports the reforms which are being implemented in the Soviet Union. According to the opinion of the head of the Italian Foreign Ministry it is necessary to create favorable conditions for the development of two processes currently under way in Europe—the integration process in the West, and the process of reforms in the East—while at the same time seeking to expand cooperation on the continent.

The tremendous importance of the upcoming visit has also been pointed out by Paulo Emilio Taviani, deputy speaker of the Italian Senate. He said during our conversation, held in connection with a meeting between Italian senators and a delegation of USSR people's deputies, Soviet writers, scientists, journalists, and public figures attending an international seminar entitled "Perestroyka, the Future of the USSR, and the Role of the West": "The Italian people are hoping for a peaceful and secure future in which freedom and justice reign. People in the Apennines treasure their friendly relations with the Soviet people—relations which have their origins in the past. We share the same European culture, which is based on the ideals of humanism."

The theme of common European culture and civilization is currently, during the days preceding M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy and the Vatican, constantly featured on the pages of the local newspapers and journals. Judging by appearances, the Italians like the "common European home" idea put forward by the Soviet leader. "I believe that such a home can be built. And what is more that it simply must be built," Umberto Domasceli, secretary general of the East-West Center public organization, has said. "I welcome the efforts made in this respect by the Soviet Union. As I see it, the common European home is not a communal apartment but a multistory building in which people can pay each other visits and communicate with each other while holding different views. The main thing is to ensure that people in the East and the West of the continent feel that they are the inhabitants of this home, that they realize how they share the same interests and problems. The events taking place on the planet under the impact of perestroyka in the USSR show that the world has embarked on a new era of detente, expansion of international cooperation, and deeper mutual understanding between countries and among people. Regular political dialogue between the leaders of various states can and must play an important role in this."

Italian business circles are actively preparing for the Soviet-Italian talks at summit level.

"Perestroyka also means business!"—reads a billboard on one of the highways leading into Rome. It is probably the most accurate reflection of the mood of the business circles interested in the development of commercial relations with our country. [passage omitted]

Addressing the national parliament a few days ago, Renato Ruggiero, Italian minister of foreign trade, noted the great interest among the country's businessmen in developing USSR-Italy economic cooperation and in switching from the traditional forms of cooperation to broader use of new forms.

"Italy," the minister went on, "will do all in its power to help the USSR to join international financial and economic organizations."

It is simply impossible to imagine Soviet-Italian dialogue without the broad cultural exchanges which have developed especially of late. [passage omitted]

Soviet-Italian business contacts in the sports sphere have also become closer. This is graphically borne out by the creation of the combined joint stock company "Di-Mod," on the basis of the "Dinamo" society and the Italian "Simod International Holdings" Company.

"We would like to know more about your country, its people, and the perestroyka which we Italians support and which we wish success. However, frankly we know too little about your country, and some of our information does not correspond to reality. To overcome this we need to develop reciprocal contacts. M.S. Gorbachev's upcoming visit serves these aims. So I wholeheartedly welcome it."

These are the words of a young inhabitant of Lasino, Monica Gonzalez. Encounters with Italians and the letters which are arriving at the TASS office in Rome and other Soviet institutions in Italy show that many people in the Apennine peninsula, Sicily, and Sardinia think the same way.

USSR, Italy Sign Commercial Cooperation Accord

LD2211000989 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—A five-year cooperation agreement was signed in Moscow today by the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the General Confederation of Italian Industrialists Confindustria.

The agreement was signed by Chairman of the Presidium of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry Vladislav Malkevich and Italian Confederation Secretary Sergio Pininfarina.

"The agreement signed today, on the eve of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy, primarily reflects the new potential of the Soviet Union and Italy in foreign economic relations," Malkevich told TASS.

"We pay special attention to the development of new forms of economic interaction, including joint ventures, production cooperation, leasing, the establishment of free economic zones and training and retraining personnel for foreign economic activity.

"We have worked out procedures to improve the efficiency of this agreement," he added.

"Members of the Confindustria," Pininfarina stressed, "would like to make utmost use of the new opportunities that have opened up for Soviet-Italian cooperation under the conditions of economic reform in the Soviet Union.

"We would like to facilitate direct contacts between Soviet and Italian opposite numbers, the realization of joint projects in various fields, the exchange of information on the state and development perspectives of the two national economies.

"We also favour holding joint seminars, symposia and exhibitions," Pininfarina pointed out.

The first joint event organized jointly by the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Italian Confindustria after signing the agreement will be a conference devoted to perspectives of economic cooperation that will be held in Italy from February 28 to March 1, 1990.

CPSU Vatican Expert Kovalskiy Interviewed

PM2811093289 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 25 Nov 89 p 12

[Interview with Anatoliy Kovalskiy, CPSU Central Committee International Department aide "officially responsible for 'European theoretical affairs'", by Ezio Mauro in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—The CPSU man who holds the delicate thread of relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin and who has studied the pope's words and deeds for the past 30 years, the man who has learned Italian and knows Latin but who has remained an atheist, is Anatoliy Kovalskiy who, at his office in the Central Committee International Department on Old Square, is officially in charge of "European theoretical affairs."

Until very recently the old CPSU could not even admit the existence of an office devoted to the Vatican, right here in the Party's inner sanctum. So for years Kovalskiy would repeat to everyone with a smile that we all have our hobbies and that his was the Vatican, ever since, as a young scientist, he was invited as an observer to two sessions of Vatican Council II and had a conversation with the pope. "I still remember the glance of a Vatican librarian as I crossed the room: His eyes revealed a fear of even being left shut in the same room as me—a real live communist, come to the Vatican from Moscow." Since then almost 30 years have gone by and there have been four changes of pope. Now that a general secretary is to pay an official visit to the pope for the first time, here is the the CPSU man's account of these 3 decades of silence from the Kremlin's viewpoint.

[Mauro] Professor Kovalskiy, on your first visit to St Peter's 30 years ago did you believe that you would some day see a general secretary setting foot in the Vatican?

[Kovalskiy] At that time it was impossible even to imagine it. But the world is changing: It is being said in Rome, and here, too. For some time now I have thought that this meeting would take place sooner or later.

[Mauro] Does this mean that Moscow has been working on Gorbachev's visit to the pope for a long time?

[Kovalskiy] No, the operational decision was relatively recent. But it was apparent that conditions were ripening. You see, the development of relations with the Vatican is part of our new conception of foreign policy, which replaces force with dialogue, places mankind at the center of everything, believes in the spiritual dimension of the new civilization, and aims at a new international morality. Inevitably this process begun by Gorbachev sooner or later had to find a point of contact with the Vatican, albeit only gradually.

[Mauro] So were direct relations between Gorbachev's perestroyka and Wojtyla's church inevitable?

[Kovalskiy] I really do believe so. In our opinion the Vatican is already taking part in this new process. We form this assessment because we are sufficiently well acquainted with the social doctrine of Catholicism and its latest developments. For instance, "Solicitudo rei humanis" contains statements that make a dialogue very possible. Meanwhile many Catholic circles are now in a period of reappraisal of the current world situation, and we are following this very carefully, too.

[Mauro] When did the thaw between the pope and the Party begin?

[Kovalskiy] There has never been absolute silence over the past 30 years. Under Pope Roncalli good mutual understanding developed: Khrushchev and John XXIII respected one another. In "Pacem in terris" Roncalli was basically the first pope to publicly abolish the prohibition on cooperation between communists and Catholics. In my opinion rations between us and the Vatican could have developed even after the pope's death. But I must say that the period of stagnation did influence the international climate. Perhaps neither the Vatican nor the USSR was ready to really improve relations.

[Mauro] In the West Paul VI is considered the pope of uncertainty, of questing, of understanding. Was the CPSU's assessment any different during his pontificate?

[Kovalskiy] Pope Montini's encyclicals, such as "Ecclesiam Suam," could have played a very great role in the growth of a dialogue between Catholics and Marxists, as could "Populorum Progressio." But Montini's practical steps, especially early in his pontificate, were small and hesitant and the dialogue encountered many specific limitations. The Montini years coincided with the Brezhnev years. During that time in the Catholic world, in which the church was finding it difficult to digest the results of the Vatican Council, there were forces that considered good relations with the USSR unnecessary. Even the meeting between the pope and Supreme Soviet Chairman Podgornyy in 1967 was more a matter of protocol than of real ideas and changed nothing.

[Mauro] Why did Brezhnev, who acted in accordance to the rationale of a major imperial power, never try to play the Vatican card?

[Kovalskiy] Brezhnev had no interest in this regard. He had other things on his mind.

[Mauro] Then Karol Wojtyla arrived in Rome. What was the CPSU's first verdict on the Polish pope?

[Kovalskiy] We thought that it would be very difficult for him to work in the Vatican. But we also though that this pope could combine a specific understanding of the socialist world with a knowledge of the western world. I believe that this is precisely the strength of Wojtyla's pontificate—the fact that he represents both parts of the world. Of course he needed to gain experience. But my impression is that he has done so successfully.

[Mauro] How did the CPSU move on from its initial mistrust of a destabilizing pope to its dialogue with a pope that can now strengthen the stability of the world's balances?

[Kovalskiy] We have never had any mistrust. I would divide our new attitude into three stages: In the first, while the Brezhnev era was coming to a close, we observed; in the second, there began a period of expectancy on both sides; and in the third stage, both we and the pope recognize that both sides' spiritual experiences can be used for the good of all. And it is clear now that the direct dialogue between the USSR and the Vatican has become possible because the two states are headed by such figures as Gorbachev and Pope Wojtyla.

[Mauro] What is your overall verdict now on John Paul II's pontificate?

[Kovalskiy] We perceive above all the pope's concern with the problems of mankind, and also his new way of looking at the world, setting Marxist collectivism and the capitalist economy on the same footing and setting Catholicism above states and systems. In our opinion he is a philosopher pope, one who knows how to think. But above all, what draws us to the pope is his vision of a single Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, which is reminiscent of Gorbachev's Common Home. Both we and the Vatican say that at the root of this Europe there lies a single civilization. The Vatican emphasizes Christianity, whereas we—while acknowledging Christianity's great role—say that other philosophies and cultures have also helped to shape the European identity. But these are differences of emphasis, no longer conflicts.

[Mauro] Where do the divergences remain?

[Kovalskiy] The pope has his own view of socialism, and we have ours. He often uses expressions in which he categorically condemns materialism as the danger that threatens world stability. We say that this is not so. But all these differences are not an obstacle to mutual understanding, at a time when interstate relations are becoming less dominated by ideology. And we consider that which unites us with the pope more important than that which divides us.

[Mauro] What still stands in the way of diplomatic recognition between the USSR and the Vatican?

[Kovalskiy] Time.

PCI Contemplates New Left-Wing Organization

PM2111194989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At PCI Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Rome, 21 Nov—A. Occhetto, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party [PCI], has delivered a report at the enlarged PCI Central Committee plenum that has opened here. The plenum was called after a PCI leadership session proposed initiating a "constituent process" for setting up a new left-wing political organization based on the PCI. This process, in particular, envisages the possibility of changing the party's name and symbols.

In his report at the plenum A. Occhetto pointed out that during the last party congress this spring "we felt that the era of blocs, the 'cold war,' and opposing systems was coming to an end." He stressed that under these conditions Italian Communists have advocated the democratic process, with the help of which the problems set by the modern situation can be solved. The events of the past few months have considerably accelerated the processes that are taking place. The shape of the world is changing at a dizzy speed.

Today, at the start of a new historical phase, when the bankruptcy of the model of real socialism is evident, the speaker went on to say, we want to strongly and confidently restate the fact that the need for socialism cannot be eradicated and that socialist prospects are the prospects of the future.

We have already said and we repeat that the West's democratic forces should respond to the bold challenge laid down by M.S. Gorbachev, the Italian communist leader said. We also reaffirm that we support all forces in the East which intend to travel the road of reform. A great responsibility should now be shouldered by West European socialist forces. It is a question, in particular, of making a great contribution in the disarmament sphere. It is in this area that Italy should come up with an initiative to cut defense spending, which will support the processes in the East European countries. European left-wing forces should develop East-West cooperation and also support the parties and forces of renewal striving to develop the democratization process in East Europe.

Going on to deal with the question of changing the PCI's name, A. Occhetto pointed out that "if, in the face of wide-ranging changes and facts that alter the entire political outlook, the party decides independently and without outside pressure to set up a new political association along with others, this will be a serious undertaking which will diminish neither the aims nor the pride of our political organization.

"Our proposal," A. Occhetto stressed, "is aimed at building new left-wing forces and a new political force, and simultaneously implies an overall reform of policy, the political system and institutions, and, above all, relations between the citizen, the state, and politics."

Yazov 'Angry' About Questions on Czechoslovakia

AU2711143289 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 27 Nov 89 p 5

[C.G. Stroehm report: "Yazov Could Not Stand Such Questions"]

[Excerpts] Accompanied by a dozen Soviet generals, admirals, and colonels, Dimitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, army general, Politburo member, and defense minister of the Soviet Union, sat in the VIP lounge of Vienna airport, with his face flaming red. Moscow's supreme military official had just visited the Austrian Army at the invitation of his Vienna counterpart Robert Lichal and had flown along the Wipptal Valley aboard a helicopter. This is the critical point where the neutral Austrian strip between the NATO partners FRG and Italy is very narrow. [passage omitted]

Asked during his visit about Hungary's wish to become a neutral country, Yazov replied impatiently: "Who in Hungary talks about a withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact? Can policy be based on rumors?" the general stressed with squinting eyes. The Soviet troops are in Hungary because of an agreement between the governments of the two countries. "If the two governments conclude a new agreement, the Soviet troops will leave Hungary," Yazov pointed out.

Yazov became really angry when asked about the CSSR. The Soviet supreme soldier snapped at a female journalist who asked him what he thinks of the events in Prague and the call for help by CSSR civil rights activists addressed to Gorbachev. "Are you Czech?" he jumped at her. "If not, why are you interested in the CSSR? By the way, we will find a common language with the CSSR...."

When the army general was confronted with more questions about Prague, he completely lost control. "I am not in the CSSR. I have not seen anything. I have no information." When the demonstrations were held in Prague, he was visiting the Austrian military academy, he stated.

The Soviet ambassador to Vienna, Gennadiy Shikin, realized that things were not going well. He sprang to his feet and whispered something into the defense minister's ear. However, a minute later Yazov was again confronted with another forthright question, asked by another female journalist. She wanted to know whether he, Yazov, would have invaded the CSSR in 1968, if he had been ordered to do so.

However, this was apparently more than Yazov could stand. He told the young journalist, who did not witness World War II: "If you were in Hitler's place, would you have dared to attack the Soviet Union again after the experiences of the year 1941?"

During the entire news conference, Yazov did not mention the name Gorbachev a single time.

Yazov on Soviet Troops in CSSR

AU2311210289 Vienna Television Service in German 1830 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] In a news conference at the end of his visit to Austria, Soviet Defense Minister Dimitriy Yazov also discussed the situation in the CSSR. Yazov said that the Soviet troops deployed in the CSSR did not have the task to interfere in the CSSR's internal affairs. The CSSR had to solve its problems itself, the Soviet Defense Minister said.

Shevardnadze Receives Spanish Envoy J.A. Yanes

LD2411204289 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received today J.A. Yanes, a special foreign policy adviser to the Spanish prime minister.

In the conversation, held in a traditional spirit of benevolence and candour that characterises Soviet-Spanish political contacts, the sides discussed topical international problems, including issues related to the situation in Europe and the shaping of new relations between East and West.

Shevardnadze and Yanes also discussed prospects of broadening cooperation between the two countries and continuing Soviet-Spanish political dialogue.

Ryutel Denies Writing Article in Swedish Paper

LD2711125989 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—Arnold Ryutel, president of the Presidium of the Estonia Supreme Soviet, has denied an article ascribed to him by the Swedish newspaper DAGENS NYHETER. The article described Estonia's entry into the Soviet Union as "unlawful."

The article, published on October 5, 1989, and ostensibly signed by him, discussed the conclusions of the commission of historians and lawyers of the Estonian Academy of Sciences who studied the events of 1940.

The article reproduced facts about the Soviet Union's foreign policy actions in that period. They were interpreted as evidence of the Soviet Union's violation of international law, treaty obligations, and as a breach of the democratic guarantee of the Estonian Republic's constitution during the election campaign and the polling days (July 14-15). The article drew a conclusion about "unlawfulness" of Estonia's entry into the Soviet Union.

In connection with the publication of the article in the Swedish newspaper, Ryutel told the Soviet news agency TASS: "I did not give any interviews to the Swedish newspaper DAGENS NYHETER and did not write such an article."

Sweden's Andersson on Cooperation with Estonia

PM2011101089 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 10 Nov 89 p 5

[Bobo Scheutz dispatch: "Estonia Has Chosen a Wise Course"]

[Text] Tallinn—Environmental cooperation to save the Baltic Sea was top of the list of the issues which Foreign Minister Sten Andersson raised during his talks with Estonian Prime Minister Indrek Toome yesterday.

He outlined, among other things, this spring's Polish-Swedish proposal for joint action for the Baltic environment, and said that there would probably soon be an invitation from the Swedish and Polish prime ministers.

"We in Sweden cannot solve our environmental problems if we do not help Poland and the Baltic republics to solve theirs," Sten Andersson said after the talks.

"I believe that a joint meeting could be the start of far-reaching technological and economic cooperation," he also said.

During the talks with the Estonian Government, the Swedish side also raised the question of how to make it easier for Swedish companies to set up in Estonia, and the question of improving communications. In December this year direct flights between Stockholm, Tallinn, and Riga will begin, but the flights will go via Helsinki, and this is of course the long way round. Some improvement is hoped for in this respect.

Sten Andersson assured the Estonians of Sweden's determination to support developments in the Baltic republics.

"On the Swedish side there is great interest in supporting the wise line on independence adopted in Estonia. It proceeds at the pace that is possible, without upsetting the perestroyka process," Sten Andersson said after the meeting.

He said that he understands the impatience among the people, but considers that the perestroyka process in the Soviet Union would be disturbed or perhaps even destroyed if this impatience had an immediate political impact.

"As far as perestroyka is concerned, Estonia could be the very country to play a decisive role, since I believe that people here have a better possibility than in any other Soviet republic of carrying forward the transformation of the Soviet Union," Sten Andersson said.

In the absence of more concrete results, Sten Andersson's Baltic trip has been pushed into the background, as far as the media are concerned, as a result of the attention paid to his remark that he is reluctant to describe the Baltic states as occupied. Since the Swedish coalition government recognized the Baltic states' incorporation into the Soviet Union as long ago as 1941, Sten Andersson in his capacity as Swedish foreign minister cannot assert anything else, even if he wanted to.

Yesterday he said that, despite everything, he hopes that the Baltic endeavors for independence will lead to the Baltic states' becoming sovereign republics within the Soviet Union.

"Then it is up to them and the Soviet Union how things develop," he said.

Pressed further on the question of the Baltic occupation, Sten Andersson said:

"I am Swedish foreign minister and my task is to act so that developments here are positive both for the Baltic peoples and for Sweden."

In other words, he cannot possibly talk about occupation, even though that is what it is.

In Estonia the question is attracting great interest at present.

In Riga for Cooperation Talks

PM2011102289 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 10 Nov 89 p 5

[Bobo Scheutz dispatch: "Swedish Information Bureau in Riga"]

[Text] Riga—Sweden wants to open an information center in the Latvian capital of Riga.

This was said by Foreign Minister Sten Andersson in talks yesterday morning with Latvian Prime Minister Vilnis Bresis.

The Swedish center would, for example, make it possible for Swedish companies to introduce themselves and their products and to pass on Swedish knowhow in various fields.

The proposal was very well received by the Latvian side. If the information center does come about it will be the second Swedish rallying point in Latvia after the branch consulate to be opened in Riga.

As in Tallinn, environmental issues were discussed, particularly the Baltic Sea, and to the Swedes' delight at the announcement that the large Sloka paper mill on the Gulf of Riga is to be closed at the end of the year. It is one of the major sources of pollution on the Latvian coast.

Prime Minister Bresis called for a greater presence of Swedish companies in Latvia and wants more Swedish-Latvian joint ventures. There were also requests for Swedish help in training enterprise managers.

CPSU Delegation Returns From Visit to France

PM2211123589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation Returns"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by A.A. Belyayev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and chief editor of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, has returned to Moscow from a visit to France as part of the party exchanges between the CPSU and the French Communist Party.

Lukyanov Talks With French, FRG Visitors Noted

PM2211123389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Europe"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, met with R: Suessmuth, chairman of the FRG Bundestag, and L. Fabius, chairman of the French National Assembly, in the Kremlin 17 November.

In the course of a friendly unconstrained conversation they noted with satisfaction that the joint visit to the USSR by the leaders of two West European states' parliaments attests to a new quality in relations between the different countries of Europe and reveals additional opportunities for fruitful cooperation with a view to strengthening international security, peace, and stability and developing comprehensive cooperation. It was stressed that supreme legislative bodies possess considerable opportunities for this. The sides discussed a number of concrete proposals aimed at further deepening ties and contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet, the FRG Bundestag, and the French National Assembly.

Silayev-Led Delegation Pays Visit to FRG

LD2711150989 Moscow TASS in English 1453 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Bonn November 27 TASS—Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, arrived here today for a visit at the head of an economic delegation for a working meeting of the co-chairmen of the USSR-FRG intergovernmental commission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation.

Helmut Haussmann, the FRG's minister of economics, is the commission's co-chairman from the West German side.

During the visit Silayev is to meet leading representatives of the FRG's business community and will tour a number of firms. His meeting with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl is also scheduled.

The principal purpose of the visit is to review the implementation of the accords reached during the visits by Chancellor Helmut Kohl to the USSR and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to the Federal Republic, to coordinate plans and methods for the commission's work and to search for further ways to stimulate and broaden economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries.

Yakovlev Receives FRG's Bahr for Discussion

LD2111180489 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—Politburo member and Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Yakovlev today received Egon Bahr, member of the Presidium of the Board of the West German Social Democratic Party (SPD).

They discussed a wide range of topical issues connected with the development of further contacts between the Soviet Communist Party and the SPD.

The meeting was held in a friendly atmosphere.

Vlasov Receives FRG's Rau, Discusses Relations

LD2311135789 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—Aleksandr Vlasov, alternate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central committee and chairman of the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers, today met Johannes Rau, minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia (FRG) who arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Russian Federation's government.

Topical matters concerning friendly contacts between the Russian Federation and North Rhine-Westphalia were touched upon during a constructive conversation.

Vlasov and Rau noted with satisfaction the expansion of mutually beneficial business contacts in the fields of the economy, construction, environmental protection, culture, education, arts and sports of late.

The partnership contacts between the Russian Federation and North Rhine-Westphalia make an increasingly tangible contribution to the development and strengthening of Soviet-West German cooperation.

The two leaders reaffirmed a mutual desire to look for new ways and forms for the further development of relations between the Russian Federation and North Rine-Westphalia.

These goals will be served in particular by the elaborated agreements on cooperation in various fields.

Vlasov drew the guest's attention to deep changes taking place in all spheres of Soviet society's life.

It was emphasised that the refinement of the economic mechanism and state administration, large-scale development of democracy and openness, and efforts towards forming a socialist rule-of-law state and many other aspects of perestroyka are creating new opportunities for economic and social development of the republic and for the broadening of its foreign contacts.

The two leaders also exchanged views on some aspects of the present-day international situation and the ensurance of peace and security in Europe.

They pointed out with satisfaction the successful character of the development of Soviet-West German relations. This was reaffirmed by Helmut Kohl's visit to the Soviet Union and Mikhail Gorbachev's reply visit to the Federal Republic.

The two leaders emphasised the importance which the Soviet Union attaches to relations with the Federal Republic and other West European home which is inconceivable without active cooperation between the two countries.

Joint Statement Signed

LD2411142689 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—Aleksandr Volkov [name as received], alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party [as received] and chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, today held his final meeting with the minister-president of the North Rhine-Westphalia Land, Johannes Rau.

The two men summed up the results of business meetings and talks in Moscow and took note of their concrete and constructive nature. Negotiations between interested Soviet organisations and representatives of the West German business community, who accompanied Johannes Rau, were marked by the same spirit.

The sides agreed that the extension of cooperation between the Russian Federation and North Rhine-Westphalia plays an increasing role in the development of Soviet-West German relations as a whole.

On the same day Vlasov and Rau signed a joint statement on extending cooperation and developing friendly relations between the Russian Federation and North Rhine-Westphalia. Documents were also signed extending ties in the economy, culture, education and sports.

FRG's Kohl Cited on East-West Relations

PM2111092189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "FRG Chancellor's Speech"]

[Text] Bonn, 18 Nov—The changes taking place in Europe and other regions of the planet have created conditions for the first time in the postwar period for the establishment of a peaceful order whereby all European peoples will be able to live together in conditions of freedom, FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl said. He was delivering a speech here to representatives of the diplomatic corps.

The process of transformations which are changing the appearance of the continent depends to a considerable extent on the success of the reforms begun on the initiative of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev, the chancellor pointed out. The FRG intends to continue to expand cooperation with the countries of East Europe.

The Soviet leader's visit to the FRG made an important contribution to strengthening FRG-USSR relations, H. Kohl pointed out. The documents signed in the course of this visit are an expression of the two countries' readiness for long-term cooperation. The striving for mutual understanding and to overcome the legacy of the past was also reflected during the recent Polish-West German summit talks in Warsaw.

Special hopes are now pinned on December's upcoming meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders, the chancellor continued. The improvement in East-West relations allows us to hope for success in the sphere of arms control and disarmament. This above all applies to the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe.

East Berliners Desire for Unification Denied

PM2011160789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Korolev dispatch: "West Berlin: Rebuff to Speculation"]

[Text] West Berlin—Some people in the West regard the inexhaustible flow of GDR citizens into West Berlin and the FRG and back again as a sign of the imminent reunification of the two Germanies in a single state.

However, a poll conducted among the GDR residents who have arrived in West Berlin during these days has shown that 70 percent of them do not want this reunification. Walter Momper, ruling mayor of West Berlin, dealt a resolute rebuff to speculation of any kind on this score in his speech to the City Chamber of Deputies.

The people of the GDR must not be underestimated, he said. Its citizens have a developed sense of their own dignity and political strength. The ruling mayor of West Berlin pointed out that there is a growing number of former GDR citizens who wish to return home. They want, he said, to participate in building their own society. He also pointed out that not a single grouping of the democratic movement in the GDR has advanced reunification as its program goal. According to him, the democratic movement in the GDR has secured freedom not in order to "place itself under the patronage of a pan-German state."

In his speech W. Momper also dwelt on questions connected with giving economic aid to the GDR. The ruling mayor pointed out that the GDR needs assistance in connection with the transformations under way there. However, he emphasized, the GDR does not need assistance of a patronizing nature or with strings attached.

In W. Momper's assessment, the people of the GDR are now writing an impressive chapter of European history. The policy of restructuring is accelerating the building of the common European home. Where the image of the enemy is being destroyed, the strategy of deterrence is also being shaken. We must learn the new thinking. Disarmament will clear the way to a Europe which will become a continent of peace, W. Momper emphasized.

West Berlin SEW Board Resigns, Events Weighed

PM2111193989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov dispatch: "Acute Discussion"]

[Text] West Berlin, 21 Nov—An extraordinary plenum of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin [SEW] Board, which has lasted a few days intermittently, has ended here.

At the start of the plenum the entire party leadership headed by its acting chairman D. Arens stated that it was collectively resigning, thereby shouldering responsibility for the mistakes committed in defining and implementing the party line.

The plenum adopted the party Board's statement on the development of events in the GDR, their impact on West Berlin, and their consequences for West Berlin's Communists. The Board members advocated the holding of a partywide meeting (conference) in the very near future to discuss the changing position in West Berlin following the opening of the border by the GDR Government, and the situation in the party. Conclusions were drawn for the restructuring of party work.

There was acute discussion at the plenum about the need to convene an extraordinary SEW Congress. The question of a congress will be finally settled at the partywide meeting, which will be empowered to make such a decision.

The Board plenum ratified the new editorial collegium of the newspaper NEUE ZEITUNG, which will be published as of 1 December 1989 to replace the newspaper WAHRHEIT.

The participants in the extraordinary plenum elected by secret ballot an "executive committee" which will lead the SEW until the general meeting and the extraordinary party congress are held.

FRG Admiral Interviewed on East-West Ties

PM2411093489 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Admiral Dieter Wellershoff, general inspector of the FRG Bundeswehr, by correspondent Captain M. Zheglov: "Admiral D. Wellershoff: 'We Should Continue the Dialogue'"—date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] In providing space in the pages of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA for Western politicians and military figures, we offer readers the opportunity to study their approaches to topical problems of security. Today Admiral Dieter Wellershoff, general inspector of the Bundeswehr, one of the FRG's top military leaders, answers questions from our newspaper's correspondent, Captain M. Zheglov.

[Zheglov] Mr Admiral, this year you visited the Soviet Union and had a series of conversations with top Soviet military leaders. What did you personally gain from that visit? What has changed in your views concerning the USSR and its Armed Forces?

[Wellershoff] The purpose of my visit was to win confidence through personal acquaintanceship. I formed the impression that the meeting was an important step along the path to achieving that objective. It is quite clear to Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and to me that these are only the first steps in this direction and that we must and will continue this dialogue and, as soldiers, should do everything in our power to prevent war in Europe.

I was briefed on the efforts of the Soviet Armed Forces to change their structure in line with political measures based on the new thinking. But it is quite clear to me that this is a complex and lengthy process. I am sure this reorientation will culminate in success. I formed the impression that there is no alternative, and this is clear to everyone.

[Zheglov] The greater part of your service is connected with the Navy. You could clearly express a competent opinion on the question of extending confidence-building measures to the naval sphere and limiting naval activity in sea areas adjacent to Europe.

[Wellershoff] For me, the further development of confidence and security building measures is of great significance, and NATO has also submitted a number of concrete proposals on this question at the Vienna talks. The mandate adopted for these talks by all the participating states does not take naval forces into account. There are valid reasons for this. On the one hand, the use of naval forces cannot be restricted to just one continent. On the other hand, NATO is an alliance of states that depend on maritime communications, that are, furthermore, divided by 6,000 km of the Atlantic Ocean, and for which free and protected maritime routes are a vital necessity.

Therefore, 6,000 km of maritime routes become, so to speak, internal lines of communication, in other words, what the railroads and highways are for you. Their protection necessarily requires unrestricted operations by NATO's naval forces, and also the holding of appropriate combat training exercises and measures.

[Zheglov] The weekly DER SPIEGEL claims that Adm D. Wellershoff is opposed to the elimination of NATO's chemical arsenals. Is that true? Is that your personal view or the position of the FRG military leadership as a whole?

[Wellershoff] DER SPIEGEL's assertion is without foundation. For many years NATO has regarded an all-embracing and verifiable ban on chemical weapons of any kind and the total elimination of stockpiles and places of manufacture as a priority political task. It is necessary to strive for this objective in every way, in particular because chemical weapons have recently been used more than once in local conflicts and more and more states have such weapons.

[Zheglov] In your country many proposals are being put forward for the structural reorganization of the Bundeswehr. A. von Buelow, a competent specialist in the military sphere, believes, for instance, that the emphasis should be on units and formations with a relatively large number of antitank systems and air defense systems, but at the same time not capable of making surprise attacks. How do you view these proposals?

[Wellershoff] Combat hardware complexes are not in themselves either defensive or offensive. Their nature depends mainly on the military-political objectives of the state and the number of combat systems at its disposal. The FRG Constitution assigns exclusively defensive functions to the Bundeswehr. Therefore the scale, structure, equipment, training, mobilization potential, and volume of provision of combat hardware to our Armed Forces are in accordance with their defensive nature. They do not have a capability for strategic offensive operations. In the current debates on the structure of the Bundeswehr there are no doubts as to the defensive orientation of our Armed Forces. It is rather a question of how to meet more fully the demands of the next decade, for instance, how to cope with the reduction in the number of draftees and the need to improve such components as the fire plan, and so forth. But no threat will emanate from our state or our Armed Forces in future. Our sole objective is to maintain peace for our country in conditions of freedom.

[Zheglov] Speaking at a press conference in Moscow, you spoke about the intention to develop military-political and military ties between the USSR and FRG Armed Forces. Could you share with us some specific ideas and proposals on this score?

[Wellershoff] The first concrete measure of this kind was the meeting with the chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, the chiefs of the main staffs of the Ground Forces, Air Force, and Navy, and, not least, Soviet officers and soldiers during my visit. Furthermore we not only talked about how to develop contacts in future, we reached agreements on these questions.

I am referring first and foremost to meetings between Armed Forces leaders and staff specialists, contacts between military academies, the exchange of articles on military questions in relevant publications, and also improvements in the working conditions for military attaches. Here it is necessary to improve the mutual exchange of information and get to know one another better, so as to strengthen and widen the basis for mutual trust.

I am glad we were able to agree on the holding of two more events this year: a formation of FRG Navy ships visited Leningrad, and the chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy is to visit the Bundeswehr academy in Hamburg.

FRG Admiral Indignant Over Ban on Visit

PM2411124189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p1

[TASS, REUTER, UPI report under the rubric "Abroad": "Refused Permission to Go"]

[Text] FRG Navy Flotilla Admiral E. Schmeling expressed his indignation in a conversation with a SUDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG correspondent about the fact that he was refused permission to go to Moscow to take part in a conference on the subject of "New Thinking and Military Policy." The Ministry of Defense Department of Appeals and the Federal Administrative Court also turned down his request. The admiral was told that he is a carrier of very important secrets and that consequently such a trip would be undesirable, the newspaper wrote. The correspondent reminds readers that, for the last 5 years, Admiral E. Schmeling has been head of the Bundeswehr department responsible for researching and conducting maneuvers. Before this, he was head of the military counterintelligence service.

Supreme Soviet Session

Culture Minister Speaks to Supreme Soviet 21 Nov

90UN0349A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 23 Nov 89 p 2

[Speech by Minister of Culture N.N. Gubenko at 21 November Supreme Soviet session in Moscow: "...Condition of Spiritual Revival"]

[Text] Respected chairman, respected deputies! Each of us has in his lifetime heard enough of self-assured utopias and promises, and I have no wish to multiply them. I can only share my thoughts—not all that competent, perhaps—about what the USSR Ministry of Culture should be doing. In my view, the ministry's main function should be the creation of conditions having a favorable impact on the creative personality. Not authorizing or banning, not standing over the artist, but knowing how to put oneself in his place and to respect him as oneself. Existing for the encouragement and expansion of the possibilities of the creative individual—this will be natural when representatives of the intelligentsia themselves and its representatives participate in the process of formulation of official cultural policy. If it is possible to make the Ministry of Culture the spokesman for the will of the intelligentsia, the ministry should then together with the deputies and all public organizations formulate the state's cultural policy, influence the community by the authority of the spiritual leaders of culture, persuade the government and prove to it the urgency of this decision or the other, and seek ways of accomplishing assignments. Simultaneously being an executive committee, put this policy into practice. This is the first thing.

Second, there is no doubt that each republic, region, and city is obliged to implement its own cultural policy and its own programs of bilateral and foreign relations. But it seems to me that the painlessness of the process of the cultural autonomization of the republics and regions at this stage should be secured by the union center. This is currently being held back by a multitude of rules and procedures. It is also obvious that if we aspire to a union of equal peoples, the union ministry should unite the republics' cultural policy for the formulation of state programs of the preservation and development of multinational Soviet art and culture as an integral whole.

The hopes connected with an extension of the sovereignty of the republics should not lead people to self-isolation. Other than enmity and egotism, nothing will come of this. The process of the revival of national dignity does not mean that the individual, a people, and a republic may be like an island. Any national culture derives from culture common to all mankind. Without adapting national interests to a mythologized unity of the Soviet people, the USSR Ministry of Culture should be a very cautious and very thoughtful regulator of the mutual exchange and mutual enrichment of the national cultures. These processes may be realized by way, chiefly, of the encouragement and financing of joint performances, library and museum exchange, the exchange of exhibitions and touring performances, support for the joint research of art historians, sociologists, and students of local lore, and the compilation of liberal arts programs for the school with the assistance of special funds, subsidies, and scholarships. We do not want a sham, depersonalized internationalism, but a personal, specific-name, if you will, practical internationalism proceeding from the interest and friendliness of each toward everyone. Perhaps I am an idealist, but I cannot imagine that the present-day intellectual, whether peasant, worker, writer, or politician, does not see a person of a different nationality as his brother. I repeat, if we intend to have a common home and if history has so ordered matters that our peoples have found themselves neighbors, the regulation of national cultural relations requires all-union resources in the state's family budget.

The following tasks require centralized activity, in my view. The first is the training and improvement of personnel. The second is social protection of cultural figures by means of the formulation of proposals for the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government, specifically, the elaboration of measures for protecting copyright and, more broadly, intellectual property, and legislation governing pensions which take account of the specific features of activity in culture and art. The third is the solution of material-technical questions. The fourth is international relations at the USSR level. No one republic can cater to such touring performances as, say, those of the La Scala Theater and international ventures of the type of the P.I. Tchaikovsky Competition and the Chekhov Theater Festival. Not to mention the fact that upon the transition to financial autonomy, culture could suffer in individual republics if not subsidized from union funds. Preventing a reduction in spending on culture and seeking opportunities for an increase therein is a mission of the Ministry of Culture. Further, as instructed by the CPSU Central Committee and the government, V.G. Zakharov has performed useful work on decentralization and the transfer of many of the ministry's functions to the union republics and the artistic unions. It is necessary to continue the work on dismantling normative restrictions and bringing the forms of accountability to the level of a reasonable sufficiency. After all, in our country it has not been the Central Committee and not the Council of Ministers that have been in charge of culture, but a government official who, recognizing the sanctity of his mission, has with bureaucratic irreproachability dispatched guiding prescriptions and received reports in keeping with his wishes. Thus is dictatorship by the slip of paper exercised. Perestroyka affords an opportunity for the politically conscious abolition of the dictatorship of the slip of paper and simplification of everything.

Now about the priorities in culture. It would be immoral to raise your hopes with premature programs and promises of immediate results. Morality means the truth. The truth, however, is that the roots of many of our economic and social troubles are to be found in the decline in morality and culture. Everyone understands that culture is vitally necessary, but not to such an extent as social protection, food, or health care. But what is man when his cherished desire is to eat and sleep. An animal only. Is there not enough confirmation and proof of this at the present time? People may in time forget about the Caribbean crisis, about the efforts which Kennedy made to ensure that everything end peacefully. People may forget Pompidou's efforts, but for the generations which enjoy the riches of world culture at the Kennedy and Pompidou centers their names will be forever linked with these centers of learning and culture.

What do I mean to say here? Until the USSR Supreme Soviet, the government, and the leaders of our state put a moral tax on culture, until culture acquires in their hearts most-favored-nation status, culture will be on the residual principle. Because another truth is that not yesterday, not today, and not tomorrow will the state have money for culture.

Leaving aside criticism of the past when culture and art were equated with the position of an orderly, whose duties included cultural service of the population, we can only cautiously rejoice that ideology has today begun to treat the restoration of culture as a condition of the country's spiritual revival and as a principle asserting the value of the human personality. But any beginning needs to be continued.

How should we best proceed? We will have to formulate principles of legislation pertaining to culture which provide for the legal protection of monuments, museum items, books, library collections, and the fundamental base of culture, including, primarily, the figure of culture and the educator. The law must protect culture against the chance of destruction.

The CPSU Central Committee and Council of Ministers decree on the compilation of a register of monuments of the USSR was issued 21 years ago. Not a single volume has appeared in Russia as yet, and 21 years have elapsed.

It is said that if we certify monuments at this pace, we will need 50 years. Five percent of monuments is destroyed annually, according to unofficial figures. One percent, according to official data. This is a disaster.

Clearly, culture cannot be extricated from a crisis situation quickly, but it will never be extricated at all unless there is a change in the position of the artist in society. Nor will we be able to solve material questions either today or tomorrow until an intellectual property act is passed. The solution, in my view, is fundamentally freeing the artist from extortion. If we cannot give to him, let us at least not take from him. It should be a customary, prosaic matter for the ensemble, performer, theater, museum, and art historian whose work is in demand to have an independent outlet to joint production, guest performances, exchange, and the publication of their works because if we take here more than is taken there, people will leave. There is no longer anyone to teach in the conservatory—there is a shortage of teachers.

It is essential to afford ensembles and performers, who might themselves conclude deals and pay the state taxes in accordance with world taxation practice, the maximum freedom of enterprise. In a word, apply international law and practice.

It is asked: will there not be a danger of these ensembles working only in the West? But every serious artist hopes that his works will be useful to the motherland. I believe that contract practice together with the application of quotas could be quite an effective regulator of performers' activity both in the motherland and abroad. And the personal, inner regulator—only the conscience.

Consequently, changing the position in society is possible with the aid of a law on culture, taking world experience as a basis. This is the first point. Second, our children are not now oriented in culture, and we are letting slip an opportunity to turn them aside from mass culture and turn them wholeheartedly toward serious art and literature, the history of their peoples, and the development of national traditions. We lack liberal arts education.

Figures show that compared with 1940, liberal arts subjects have been cut in the schools by one-third. In my view, a state program of the humanitarianization of school and institute education is needed. There arises in this context the question of libraries as a fundamental value of the nation and its brain. Without them it is impossible to preserve memory, pass on cultural traditions, and introduce the people to learning. An official policy which restores a civilized attitude toward libraries is essential. Not only the creation and upkeep of the physical plant, but also a considerable increase in appropriations, foreign currency included, for the purchase of foreign publications, the training of personnel in the best universities of the country and abroad, and decent material remuneration for library personnel. It is essential to increase the independence of scientific libraries in the formation of collections and in deciding personnel questions.

Next, our country is one-third agrarian—village, aul, kishlak, hamlet. Approximately 30 million persons are employed in peasant labor, and 9 million of them lack the opportunity to even watch television. The majority of regions can receive only the first program. What kind of universal literacy and what kind of culture is it under conditions where there is simply nothing for a person to do? And, other than the vodka bottle—this convertible currency—he sees none and has no other possibilities of replenishing his impressions. Consequently, what is needed is an official cultural policy in which the village, its provision with television, stimulation of the rural cultural worker, encouragement of the informals and the self-performances of the population, and the development of crafts and skills associated with traditional culture should acquire a priority direction. The best performers, theaters, and museum exhibitions, concentrated, as a rule, in the centers and at permanent establishments, should obtain additional financial incentives prompting an interest in work in the countryside. Of course, the state has a right to expect selfless devotion on the part of the intelligentsia. What, if not selfless devotion, spared us the catastrophe of the diversion of the northern rivers? But socialism, Lenin said, needs to be built not on enthusiasm, but with the aid of enthusiasm, on prudent calculation. Circumstances are taking shape currently such that culture is not, seemingly, a part of this prudent calculation of socialism. One- and two-tenths of a percent on culture—this is an appeal to enthusiasm which will dry up in the same way as the state coffers are drying up. Where is the money to come from? But first ask how much is needed? No one will answer because no one has added it up and has not done so because there has never been and is not now money for culture. For the purpose of overcoming the residual principle, the Central Committee instructed the Council of Ministers, the Academy of Sciences, and the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] in 1987 to draw up proposals concerning the sources of the financing of culture. It was proposed that the first source of financing be an official all-union per capita minimum expenditure on culture. The second, all that was over and above the minimum would be provided by the republics, and the third source, the city and rayon themselves. There was a proposal for the imposition of a culture tax on all enterprises producing national income. What would all this give us? First, were we to impose an all-union quota per capita, we would be pursuing an official policy in culture, and, of course, such-and-such an amount would mean such-and-such a policy also. Second, were the all-union quota to be supplemented by the republic budget, real independence of the republics' cultural policy precluding the monopoly of the union ministry would be created. Third, enterprise taxes would afford local cultural policy real independence. What is happening with these proposals I do not know. I only know from my personal perceptions that there is a danger of the commercialization of culture and art. There are many absurdities here: the self-repayability of the theaters, the self-repayability of the philharmonic societies, the self-repayability of the museums. This is not the case anywhere in the world. The percentage of subsidies in our country is lower than in any West European country, socialist included, although they have commercial art, and the state has a connection with this. But serious art in all countries is subsidized by parliament and congress. But we increase ticket prices and take money from the people for visiting a museum to view what belongs to them, the people. We need to introduce a system of incentive actions which would remove the barriers between the poorest strata and art. This is shameful. There are throughout the world free passes for children, students, soldiers, and pensioners, but not with us.

Now a word or two about the procedure of financing. We need to have done with scattering money on trifling matters. A little for everyone is the wrong method. We need to finance programs, as is done in other countries. If a program for library development in the country is drawn up, it must be evaluated in money and material human resources, and only then must money be allocated for a specific program. In all other cases it is impossible to say what is meant by much, and what is meant by not enough. No country gives culture an infinite amount.

Of course, if a republic formulates some program of its own, there should be all-union funds supplementing the republics' possibilities because the republics and regions do not have equal conditions and will need the center's assistance.

Finally, about our reserves. Decentralization will make it possible to incorporate in cultural life spiritual potential which has not yet been engaged owing to the alienation of the national intelligentsia, whose concern for problems of cultural activity has for decades been held back by the center's mean-arithmetical indications for different republics. True national cultural autonomy entrusts to the national intelligentsia a special mission, whose basis is the honor of the motherland and the wealth of knowledge and industriousness, and which should rely on the selflessly devoted intellectual personifying in the eyes of the people the highest moral force.

Next, not simply contacts but close cooperation with the church, the informals, students, and emigres will help us restore the edifice of spirituality and deliver the country from boorishness and lack of culture. This is my belief. Although Kireyevskiy said: "Belief is not so much knowledge of the truth as devotion." I believe that only unity of efforts, and not egotism and separatism, may produce results. And lest you get the impression that I am placing exclusive hopes in the intelligentsia only, I would like to align myself with Chekhov, whose opinion I share. "I do not believe in the intelligentsia," Chekhov said, "which is hypocritical, fraudulent, hysterical, uneducated, and indolent; I do not believe in it even when it suffers and complains for its oppressors come from the heart thereof. I believe in individual people; I see salvation in individual personalities, be they intellectuals or muzhiks. They have power, although they are few. They perform an imperceptible role in society and they are not dominant, but their work is evident. Whatever, science moves on. Public self-awareness is growing, moral issues are beginning to assume an uneasy nature, and all this is happening unbeknownst to the prosecutors, engineers, and intelligentsia as a whole and in spite of everything." Thank you for listening.

Article Discusses Supreme Soviet Press Bill

PM2811094989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by S. Karkhanin and G. Orlovskiy: "The Offending Comma. On the Discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Excerpt] Should a reporter be responsible for information that he has received from a high-ranking militia official? The answer would seem to be clear. However, the court found an original approach....

Here is an actual example. A report entitled "In the Brazier's Smoke" cited information from an officer of the Moscow City Internal Affairs Administration: A man under investigation by the all-union authorities had become head of a cooperative. After the article was published the cooperative worker went to court to protect his honor and dignity. And even though the investigation was abandoned after the publication, the court ruled that because measures to secure the appearance of the defendant—detention in custody—had been replaced during the investigation by recognizance not to leave, the information did not correspond to the facts and the newspaper must publish a retraction.

This barely intelligible formula came to mind when the participants in the Supreme Soviet session were given a copy of the draft Law on the Press. There had been much discussion on the document and great hopes were pinned on it. Even from the rostrum, B.N. Nikolskiy, deputy chairman of the deputies' Commission on Questions of Glasnost, persistently called for the more rapid discussion of the draft law, which is capable, in his words, of protecting progressive representatives of the press from unjustified persecution. Generally speaking, the time has come to look at the document and consider how and whom it will help if it is adopted in its present form.

What are the aims and tasks of the Soviet press? They aren't even mentioned. The authors also managed without using the word "socialism," as though emphasizing that they are creating a normative act far removed from politics. Despite the fact that such an approach is hardly legitimate because V.I. Lenin convincingly proved long ago that the press cannot be "nonparty."

The press is too keen a weapon to be allowed to fall into just anybody's hands. Nevertheless, that idea is enshrined in the draft, which provides for the right of any person to issue his own medium of mass information. In other words, it is proposed to transfer the press to private hands or, more precisely, to the hands of those who have enough money to publish a newspaper. It is no coincidence that in the recess between sessions discussing the draft, USSR People's Deputy G.Kh. Shakhnazarov explained to foreign journalists:

"In your country the director of a publishing company would not allow any of his newspapers to suddenly pursue a line contrary to his politics, would he? He would rightly sack the editor and find a more compliant one. Private ownership is private ownership. But does that mean that in our country, the editorial office should not be accountable to the publisher? By the way, if you were to ask the sides in the debate you would find out that the publishers and founders believe that their rights have been violated."

The law, which is supposed to clarify the legal basis of mutual relations between the founder of a press organ and the publication itself, does not yet define them, in the opinion of a number of deputies who addressed the session. The reciprocal lack of responsibility is compounded by a lack of responsibility toward the reader. Therefore the concept proposed by the authors of the draft seems dubious because it is based on an attempt to do the impossible: to combine the functions of the press in society with "freedom" from the interests of the various social groups. [passage omitted]

Moscow TV Relays 27 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings

1600 GMT

LD2711182889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 27 November begins broadcasting a recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov, candidate Politburo member and first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Lukyanov begins with an overview of the proposed items on the agenda. The vote on the draft law on press and media, which was discussed on 24 November, will be taken today, following CPSU member Shakhnazarov's reply to various questions.

At 1605 GMT Shakhnazarov says that quite a few questions have come in. He then reads out comments that have been received: the status of editors, the need for a democratic relationship between publisher and editor, etc. Shakhnazarov proposes that the law be returned to the committee for further refinement after its first reading.

At 1614 GMT Lukyanov says that the law should indeed be discussed further in the Committees on Legislation and Legality, Glasnost, and International Affairs, and then it should be published in the press for discussion.

At 1615 GMT Deputy (Subintsov) proposes that the variant draft originally proposed to the deputies should also be published in the press. Other deputies make further points.

At 1618 GMT Lukyanov says that one draft law on the press should be published and that the main provisions should be approved here and now, to enable further refinement of the document. At 1620 GMT the vote is held: 376 vote for this proposal, 8 against, and 13 abstentions. Lukyanov complains that only 397 of the 418 deputies present actually voted.

Lukyanov then invites Kakimbek Salykov, chairman of the Ecology Committee, to present a report on nature conservation and environmental protection.

At 1622 GMT Salykov refers to letters received about the rational utilization of natural resources. He discusses some technicalities of the wording of the text of the draft law and asks deputies to consult their copies of the document.

At 1626 GMT Lukyanov says that Deputy Ryabchenko sent him a note, in which the latter states that one proposal about stopping the work of the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station and the construction of new reactors until safety procedures have been absolutely perfected was not examined by the committee.

At 1629 GMT Salykov says that the proposal about Chernobyl was considered and that an expert group is to be set up and no decision will be made until the group reports back.

At 1630 GMT Salykov says that the USSR Council of Ministers is to review question of the Azov Sea.

At 1631 GMT Deputy Gayer says that it is necessary to pass laws now and not to leave everything until next year.

At 1632 GMT Lukyanov says that other proposals came in, including one about Lake Sevan.

At 1633 GMT Salykov says that these matters were discussed.

At 1634 GMT Lukyanov says that most of these proposals are proposals by individual deputies and that all proposals seem to have been discussed at the committee stage. An unidentified deputy says that only the most important points should be contained in the final document; otherwise, the quality of the eventual law will suffer.

At 1637 GMT Deputy Yablokov says that the committee is having to review the ecological situation in all regions of the country. Yablokov says that it is an immense task and proposes that the draft law be approved as it stands at the moment.

At 1638 GMT Raybchenko says that the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] is still polluting the atmosphere with radiation, and, therefore, its exploitation is not entirely safe. Ryabchenko says that the matter of the Chernobyl AES must, therefore, be included in the draft law.

At 1640 GMT Lukyanov says that such an issue cannot be covered with complete satisfaction in just one sitting.

At 1641 GMT Salykov answers a point about holding regional ecological referendums. He says it is difficult to know whether such referendums are necessary.

At 1643 GMT Deputy Obolenskiy proposes that republic supreme soviets make decisions about nature protection within provisions for lease-contracting and financial autonomy. He cites the example of the deforestation of northern areas of the country. Lukyanov then says that he respects the proposal which has been moved by many deputies. However, he says, it cannot be considered without discussion at the committee stage.

1646 GMT

LD2711190789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1646 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Continuing the debate on ecological measures and issues, Deputy (Arutyunyan) raises the point of ecology at Lake Sevan. An unidentified deputy says that the Siberian region knows many examples of serious pollution and that measures should be passed to specifically deal with this point.

At 1648 GMT Deputy Kirilov proposes a referendum before any nuclear electric power stations are built. Lukyanov says that this should be discussed in committees.

At 1649 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes tariffs for pollution and makes a point about leasing.

At 1650 GMT Deputy Komarov of the Ecology Committee says that the entire country needs ecological recovery and that one cannot take individual measures for each region.

At 1651 GMT Lukyanov reads out a deputy's proposal, which condemns the fact that committee members are opposing a draft document which they approved in the committee. A vote is taken on ending the debate: 381 for, 9 against, 8 abstentions.

At 1654 GMT Lukyanov calls a vote on the draft law: 391 for, 5 against, 3 abstentions.

At 1656 GMT a deputy asks for a vote on the Azov Sea, including a point on the Azov Sea in the draft law later: 91 for, 275 against, 24 abstentions. Lukyanov then proposes that the Azov Sea measure be passed on to the Ecology Committee for examination.

At 1658 GMT a 15-minute break is announced by the TV announcer for broadcast of a children's program.

At 1713 GMT recorded Supreme Soviet proceedings resume. Lukyanov sums up previous debate on status of USSR people's deputies.

At 1715 GMT Pivovarov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on the Operation of Soviets of People's Deputies, Development of Administration, and Self-Government, delivers a 20-minute report on the proposed draft law on the status of deputies. A separate section will be devoted to deputies' mandates, he says, and gives details of how instructions received by deputies from voters are to be handled. Enquiries from deputies and replies to them will be published. Deputies can involve people's control officials when investigating malpractices. Deputies' transport and other allowances are dealt with in the draft. There are provisions for releasing deputies from their jobs and deputies' immunity is the subject of specific provisions. Pivovarov describes some of the deputies' suggestions and amendments that were not accepted. Pivovarov deals with the procedure for recalling deputies, he says that the Congress of People's Deputies will discuss recall.

At 1735 GMT Deputy Kalmykov cites the importance of the draft on the status of deputies as a political and legal document. He says that a proposal for the allocation of special housing for deputies was turned down and that the establishment of regional groups will help coordinate deputies' work. Deputies are allowed not to fulfill a voter's mandate if it conflicts with their convictions or program.

At 1740 GMT Krayko says he was in the working group. He makes a point about deputies' expenses and leave allowances. Lukyanov clarifies that the provisional regulations will be examined and confirmed.

At 1744 GMT Podziruk raises the issue about deputies in the Army. Then Deputy Klibik asks about deputies' signatures. Nikolaychuk offers a rewording of a paragraph in the draft and says the he wants the law published in the press. A deputy expresses the desire for immunity to prohibit personal searches. Another deputy makes further points.

At 1752 GMT Sakharov says that electoral instructions reflect the desire of only part of the electorate, thus they are an anachronism and undemocratic.

At 1753 GMT Lukyanov gives the background to the electoral mandate system. There are more interventions on recall and on status.

1757 GMT

LD2711202389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1757 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Continuing the debate on people's deputies issues, Deputy Boldyrev says he wants the draft law on recall to be published so that people can give their views before the Congress of People's Deputies.

At 1758 GMT Deputy Kryuchenkova raises the point whether the debate is on a law on recall or provisional regulations on recall. Lukyanov says the congress instructed the Supreme Soviet to prepare a law.

At 1759 GMT Deputy Kim makes a point about recall. Lukyanov reads article 107 of the Constitution. Let's go by that, Lukyanov says.

At 1801 GMT Deputy Pivovarov replies to the points raised: mechanism for checking signatures, work of the electoral commission, Nikolaychuk's point, deputies' expenses.

At 1806 GMT Lukyanov take a vote to pass the law on status and hand it to the congress: 387 for, 1 against, 10 abstentions.

At 1808 GMT Lukyanov suggests that the draft Law on Recall should be voted on and submitted to the congress, and that the congress should then decide what to do: 342 for, 14 against, 18 abstentions. The decision is passed.

At 1813 GMT Lukyanov calls a vote on whether to publish a draft Law on Recall, as suggested by Boldyrev. He is interrupted on the point of how other countries deal with obligatory instructions from voters. Boldyrev's proposal is turned down: 113 for, 224 against, 29 abstentions.

At 1818 GMT there is a vote on Nikolaychuk's proposal: 103 for, 117 against, 78 abstentions. Some protest that there isn't a quorum. Lukyanov says 362 is a quorum.

At 1822 GMT a deputy champions the rights of deputies absent from sessions.

At 1824 GMT Aleksandr Nikonov, president of the USSR Academy of Agriculture Sciences, comes to the rostrum to speak about the draft Law on Land. He says there have been many useful verbal and written proposals. The idea is to create the circumstances for the peasants to provide people with bread as efficiently as possible. For the peasant, the land is the chief means of production, so while land is the property of the people, those who work the land on a family or collective basis are "full masters" of it. Nikonov goes on to talk about ecological provisions of the law. Nikonov goes on to cover some of the further amendments and additions to the draft law: measures to protect national minorities, local soviets to have final say on matters of land, and leasing proposals brought into line with recently passed law. He asks the Supreme Soviet to give it a first reading.

At 1842 GMT a deputy asks what has changed in the concept behind the draft law. Nikonov says there have been substantial changes.

At 1843 GMT Deputy Bisher says he is worried about the provisions affecting republican rights as against "general state" jurisdiction. Nikonov reads out some provisions from the law.

At 1848 GMT another deputy asks if the land is the property of the people living on it, why don't they have full jurisdiction over it? Nikonov says undoubtedly there will be further republican laws to cover this point. Kirilov asks about the individual peasant's right to land. Laws on republics must cover this, Nikonov says.

At 1851 GMT Lukyanov asks if the concept should be accepted or sent back for revision.

At 1852 GMT Sobchak says that the law does not establish state ownership of the land, the local soviets have jurisdiction over it. He says all-union jurisdiction is severely restricted in the draft law.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Shundeyev says the law is closely linked to private ownership; he asks about the buildings on the property.

At 1900 GMT Deputy (Kholotnyuk) expresses support for the draft law on land.

1906 GMT

LD2711220789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1906 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Valentinov takes the floor and presents a statement from a group of deputies from autonomous republics, oblasts, and krays. He complains about amendments which he had been told would be included in the text, but were in fact omitted. He asks what is the point of deputies from autonomous republics taking part in the work of the session. At 1911 GMT Lukyanov says he understands what Valentinov said, but disagrees with the point about the presence of deputies from autonomous republics.

At 1913 GMT Deputy Rayg takes the floor. He speaks about the increasing problems that peasants are facing and the need to tackle them, despite comments to the effect that the peasants have endured enough changes and should be left alone.

At 1917 GMT another deputy requests that another commission be allowed to speak. Lukyanov then announces an interval.

At 1918 GMT President Gorbachev is in the chair at the session. He asks for Supreme Soviet members to register; 409 are present. He reminds the deputies that on 24 November it was agreed that appropriate commissions should consider Baltic matters.

At 1921 Deputy Vologzhin takes the floor. After reading out parts of a document and the comments of various named deputies, he strongly urges people's deputies to show diplomacy in their discussions.

At 1929 GMT Deputy Abalkin then takes the floor and highlights the special features of the law. He presents two financial elaborations, which the government recommends, and goes on to propose alternations to the wording.

At 1937 GMT an unidentified deputy asks about the unity of currency to be used in interrepublican dealings—the ruble—if republics have their own units. Abalkin reminds deputies that this clause was approved in its first reading, but notes that the formulation of the relevant clause is sufficiently flexible.

At 1942 GMT several deputies speak at floor microphones requesting clarifications on the wording.

At 1956 GMT Abalkin offers replies on many details and refers to the appropriate clauses. He reminds deputies that the transition to economic independence requires enormous responsibility and effort and completely removes the option of bewailing Moscow or the center's failure to provide this; that, or the other. He refers to housing and the education provision as an example. He says the Baltic states will have to take responsibility from start to finish.

At 2006 GMT Deputy Akhromeyev takes the floor and asks a question concerning a republic's right to engage in foreign currency operations. Abalkin says that only the currency of the USSR may be used in this way.

At 2008 GMT a deputy raises further questions concerning the use of different units of currency. Abalkin replies and is interrupted by Gorbachev who himself asks the question: What currency will people from one republic use use when they visit another republic? Abalkin replies, but reminds deputies that a vote on the whole matter will be held.

At 2023 GMT a deputy holds up a copy of an Estonian youth newspaper, in which a draft law on immigration is printed. He asks Abalkin to comment. Abalkin declines.

2008 GMT

LD2811014589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2008 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev says he thinks that more people want to speak, judging by the number of notes he has received. He points out, however, that the discussion has been centering on issues that have already been decided. He proposes voting article by article. There are 423 Supreme Soviet members present. He suggests a vote on the preamble. A deputy proposes an amendment. Gorbachev asks for a vote on the preamble, together with the amendment: 339 for, 53 against, 26 abstentions. The preamble is adopted.

At 2030 Gorbachev says, "Now article one. I think that here there have been attempts to submit amendments, elaborations, and clarifications on the issues that have been at the center of the discussion, and I ask comrades to take the floor if they want to submit them."

Deputy Alksnis says, "I propose that point one—the adoption of legislative documents ensuring restructuring and the functioning of the social and economic systems of a republic—should either be removed completely, because without this law can we say a republic is really empowered to adopt such documents? Or, to it should be added the words which do not contradict the USSR Constitution. Because the example of the Estonian

Soviet Socialist Republic Law on Immigration, clearly shows that such legislative documents will be adopted for the purposes of restructuring. For this reason, I propose the addition of the words which do not contradict the USSR Constitution, or remove the point completely."

Gorbachev says, "Comrades, I want you just [changes thought] what kind of idea, attitude did I have to jurisprudence? I think that inasmuch as what is at issue—one moment, no, one moment—inasmuch as what is at issue is that we [changes thought] everything that is happening here, including in the Supreme Soviet and also in the republics, it all takes place within a federation. A fedration is based on certain constitutional principles. For this reason, it is natural for any kind of state entity, including a federation, to have the principle that laws canot function which—on the territory of that federation, in any part of it—contradict the Constitution. For this reason, to write an entry here is to repeat the Constitution."

Alksnis says, "Mikhail Sergeyevich, Mikhail Sergeyevich. I can raise an objection to you. The thing is that in the Baltic republics, the primacy of republican laws has been established with regard to union laws. Declarations of sovereignty have been adopted and have been written in the constitutions of the union republics. That is, this law will still go through the ratification process in the supreme soviets of the Baltic republics. I hope that comrades will have comprehended this, that the fate of this law will still be decided in the supreme soviets of the union republics. For this reason, I feel that we have to have it registered here that they do not contradict the USSR Constitution."

Gorbachev says, "I think that you are probably referring to those documents that the Supreme Soviet Presidium revoked [voices in the hall] on the basis that they contradict the USSR Constitution. If others have appeared, then, then, no, and all the same, that is the situation for everyone who is in the federation and who has adopted laws that contradict—if on this score there is a decision of the Presidium, and note that its functions, its jurisdiction also covers the monitoring of the implementation of union legislation on the whole territory, and it has adopted, that means that that is the, that the question has been decided in this way, and that is the situation."

At 2036 GMT Ryzhkov suggests a redraft. Gorbachev says that this would complicate the whole process. Primakov reads out proposed amendments.

At 2037 GMT a deputy warns his colleagues against setting a dangerous precedent by the way the vote is conducted. Deputy Alksnis tries to speak again, but his comments are inaudible.

2044 GMT

LD2811014989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2044 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Primakov again reads out a proposal on how to proceed. Gorbachev reminds deputies of the government's amendments. He asks for a vote on each amendment. First amendment 326 for, 38 against, 36 abstentions. Second amendment: 357 for, 19 against, 24 abstentions. Third amendment: 324 for, 53 against, 29 abstentions.

He asks for the deputies' view on a named vote on the draft as a whole, together with the amendments which have been passed: 283 for, 64 against, 43 abstentions. Gorbachev then puts to a named vote the draft and the passed amendments: 296 for, 67 against, 37 abstentions. Gorbachev then reads out the voting results by chamber. The draft is passed. Deputies stand and applaud.

An interval is announced; there is a break until 2108 GMT, during which the evening "Novosti" is broadcast.

At 2108 GMT the recording of the Supreme Soviet session resumes. Primakov is in the chair. Unnamed deputy speaks on the draft Law on Land. He says he is worried about the "neo-Stalinist" treatment of autonomous administrative divisions and ethnic groups in the proposals. The law contradicts the just-passed law on ownership, he says. The Law on Land must safeguard ethnic minorities. Another unidentified deputy says he is also worried that the new draft contains elements of a previously discarded version. He says it is artificial to divide land into agricultural land subject to "ownership" and industrial land subject to "use."

At 2121 GMT a deputy says he wants the government version, with the addition of an amendment from deputies. Another deputy at 2124 GMT says it is inappropriate to split the country into feudal states, as some people want.

At 2127 GMT Primakov says that there is no set document under which draft laws can be officially published.

At 2129 GMT Deputy Kugultinov speaks about the importance of the Law on Land for everyone in the country. It is no use repeating the formulas which were accepted in the past. He says that it is impossible to pass the draft law at the first reading in its present form.

At 2132 GMT Primakov says that there are two possibilities now: one is to adopt the draft law at the first reading; the other is to return the draft law to the committee for further work.

At 2132 GMT Deputies Chernichenko and Yemelyanov speak. They say that the draft Law on Land is important and must be passed at a first reading, "warts and all." Yemelyanov says that the deputies must get out of bad old habits of pretending to work. It is important to decide things now and to get moving.

At 2138 GMT an unidentified Baltic deputy talks about the importance of accepting deputies' proposals about autonomous republics. Deputy Apopoyan proposes setting up a working group.

At 2141 GMT a deputy refers back to Kugultinov's remarks.

2142 GMT

LD2811015189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2142 GMT on 27 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet 27 November session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Nishanov speaks about how the interests of all, including the autonomous republics, are taken into consideration in the draft Law on Land. He proposes that the draft law be published so that all can see this.

At 2144 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks about the importance of the draft Law on Land from the point of view of people's sovereignty. Deputy (Gayer) says that it is important to recognize the right of land for peoples without an official statehood.

At 2146 GMT Primakov says that he suppors the idea of publishing the draft law. Deputy Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Nikonov urges, on behalf of the Agrarian Affairs Committee, that the draft Law on Land be passed at the first reading.

At 2150 an unidentified deputy speaks about the importance of accepting the given document as a basis for future work. However, he opposes publication of the draft law on the current unrefined form for a people which has not yet fully awakened.

At 2151 GMT Primakov urges the deputies to allow a vote to be taken. A deputy proposes that the law be passed at the first reading.

At 2154 GMT Deputy Osipov says that it is wrong to think in narrow terms about the land being solely a subject of crop farming.

At 2155 GMT Primakov says that he will accept no more debate. A vote must be taken. Registration shows 383 deputies, a quorum, to be present.

At 2156 GMT a vote is taken to pass the law on land at the first reading, handing the document back to the committees, and publishing it subsequently in the press: 332 for, 21 against, 15 abstentions.

At 2158 GMT Primakov raises the issue of an amnesty for servicemen who were guilty of crimes in Afghanistan. This issue had been left over from a previous sitting.

At 2159 GMT a deputy proposes excluding the third and fourth points of the draft law on this matter. Primakov then asks if there are any points about this draft law.

At 2201 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for brackets to be removed in the fourth point. He says that deputies should realize that this decision will excuse all those who were sadistic murderers, as well as people who were victims of the situation.

At 2201 GMT Primakov asks the representative of the relevant committee to speak. The representative is not present, so Primakov adjourns the session until 28 November.

The broadcast of this recording concludes at 2201 GMT.

Supreme Soviet Approves Draft Land Law

LD2711184489 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament has approved in the first reading the main provisions of the draft fundamentals of land legislation of the USSR and union republics. The object of the legislation is to radically change the Soviet land use system and create a new legal basis for land relations in the country.

The draft stipulates that land is the inalienable heritage of the people residing on a given territory, and authorises the local soviets to decide its uses. The legislation provides, among other things, for giving land into lifelong inheritable posession—to collective and state farms and other agricultural enterprises. The concept of state ownership of land is absent from the draft.

Aleksander Nikonov, president of the USSR Academy of Agriculture Sciences, said that the draft makes it possible to overcome "statisation" and the idea that land is "nobody's."

Besides, the Soviet parliament passed a law on the economic independence of the three Baltic republics—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Speakers in parliament described this as an important step towards giving new economic substance to the Soviet Federation.

Also approved in the first reading were the chief provisions of the draft law on the press and other mass media and a decision was taken to publish it for public discussion.

The draft contains guarantees of freedom of the press, of the rights of journalists and speaks of the inadmissibility of censorship.

The deputies adopted a decision on urgent measures to improve the ecological improvement of the country. The Soviet parliament will resume work on Tuesday [28 November].

Supreme Soviet Holds Joint Session 28 Nov

Session Previewed

LD2811081189 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament again met for a joint meeting of both chambers today. First USSR Supreme Soviet Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov chairs the session.

The deputies will make decision about the amnesty of former Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan who committed crimes.

The session will discuss amendments to basic principles of the criminal legal procedure in the USSR and union republics.

The parliament will also discuss bills on socialist enterprise and leaves of absence.

The USSR Supreme Soviet's second session is expected to end today.

Servicemen's Amnesty Law Adopted

LD2811101889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS)—A TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The decision on an amnesty for former servicemen of the contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan who committed crimes, which was adopted today by the Soviet parliament, is an important act of mercy.

The document says: Guided by humanitarian principles, the USSR Supreme Soviet releases these people from criminal responsibility for the crimes committed by them while on military service in Afghanistan during the period from December 1979 to February 1989.

At the same time, persons who have already been convicted by Soviet courts for such crimes are relieved of serving their sentences and the convictions are quashed of persons who have served sentences.

Presenting the draft decision to deputies, Yuriy Golik, member of the parliamentary Committee on Legislation, stressed that this amnesty is of a general nature and also concerns those who are now abroad. Such a clause takes into account the suggestions expressed by deputies during work on the document.

The focus of today's discussion was the fourth article of the submitted draft, in accordance with which it was proposed not to extend an amnesty to persons that had committed premeditated killings in aggravated circumstances. Many deputies pointed out that such a clause may make the return to the homeland of Soviet prisoners of war difficult. Deputies, participants in combat actions in Afghanistan, the parliamentary Committee on Youth Matters, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, and Academician Andrey Sakharov spoke out in particular for the exclusion of this article.

Guided by humane considerations, the USSR Supreme Soviet agreed with these suggestions and excluded the article from its decision.

The decision of the Soviet parliament on an amnesty was adopted by an absolute majority of votes and was met with applause. It goes into force from 15 December 1989.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Chairs Constitutional Commission Meeting

LD2711192989 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—The Constitutional Commission established by the Congress of People's Deputies held its meeting here today. It was chaired by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

After Gorbachev's report, the commission discussed questions concerning an approach to the concept of a new constitution (fundamental law of the USSR) and determined the order of its work.

It was found expedient to set up a working group to compile the draft of a new USSR Constitution.

Sakharov Says State of Emergency Not Ruled Out

LD2711233989 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2200 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 27 (TANJUG)—Andrey Sakharov, academician and people's deputy in Supreme Soviet of the USSR, said the introduction of a state of emergency in the Soviet Union due to the miners' strikes and "possible student unrest" was not ruled out.

As learned today, Sakharov said in talks with the All-Soviet Student Forum in Moscow recently that as far as a state of emergency is concerned, such a threat existed.

The world renowned scientist added, however, that he hoped the state apparatus, which he described as conservative, realized that such a decision would be suicide. The possibility of a peaceful transition is not yet lost in our country, Sakharov said.

Responding to questions from the students, Sakharov said that the Soviet Communist Party was the ruling political force but that it need not be the only such force and cannot hold such a position thanks to the country's Constitution.

He said he did not consider state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev an enigma. Even when it is going towards the right, the country is nevertheless moving left, he added.

Sakharov supported the Baltic republics in their drive for independence even when they "went too far," because, he said, this could be corrected and [words indistinct] was in essence positive.

Asked whether it was possible for the Ukraine, as one of the major components of the federation, to leave the USSR, Sakharov said that everyone had the right to leave but asked how practicable this would be for the union and for that republic.

Moscow TV's Korzin Interviews Yakovlev

LD2811042589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Interview with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by political observer V. Korzin; date, place not given; from the "Political Rostrum" program—recorded]

[Text] [Korzin] Alekandr Nikolayevich, although the program is called "Political Rostrum" I don't wish our conversation to have the nature of an oration. I simply wish to have a talk about the questions people are asking both themselves and us journalists. Of course, it is impossible to reply to all the questions placed by life, but let us try to reply to some of them. For example, about a week ago you returned from Japan. Now one could say that already you are packing your bags for Italy. It is striking how tightly packed events are and what hard work it is, but at the same time the question also arises: Are we not devoting too much attention to international events at a time when everything is not in order at home?

[Yakovlev] It is difficult to give an unambiguous reply. It is true that there is a great deal of work at home, but I think that the idea—although I know that this point of view exists in our country, it is current, it is widespread—is mistaken. I don't think that we would be able to arrange our affairs correctly at home without a very considerable breakthrough in international affairs, and this is occurring. Starting with what the many years of self-isolation have given us, we now know from experience that it did not lead to anything good.

In the economic sphere there was the creation of kinds of socialist monopolies, that is total disregard for the consumer. They were weaned away from competition. From the spiritual point of view, this also brought society many troubles. In the political sphere, we drove ourselves into isolation, into a blind alley, creating in fact objective possibilities for seeking out the devil incarnate and all our ills. This also created a certain complacency within the country. In reality, perhaps in general, it was being very widely stated—and our propaganda was to a large degree built on this—that everything was better here, everything was in order, everything was fine.

[Korzin] Perhaps banking on force?

[Yakovlev] Yes, of course. It must be said here that the United States and the West succeeded somehow in drawing us into the mindless arms race which brought us many troubles—economic and psychological, I should say, psychological too—and it is only now that we are starting to clear away the blockades of this actual policy and of the psychological moods and political approaches, what we call the new political thinking.

Returning now to the question you asked, I believe that the breakthroughs in international policy must now help us, and are already helping us in our internal affairs. About the issue of disarmament, it is a direct response to the challenge of the time. Its benefits, how shall I say, are material, political, and psychological. Look at the settlement of our relations with China. Isn't that a very major historic breakthrough? Or, shall we say, the settlement of the atmosphere troughout Europe. We are already realistically setting the task of a common European home. Was it possible to imagine all this 5 years ago, that such a task could arise in general? Of course not! You see, Europe in general, detente began there; the roots of detente didn't, after all, wither there. Europe has had enough of fighting. I think that having had enough of fighting isn't all: It has finished fighting. The people of Europe can see that they don't need the mountains of weapons that are still being kept in Europe. The threat from the Soviet Union that was built up, by fair means and foul, on both sides has gone away, in general.

[Korzin] All the same, I would like to return from the common European home to what we have in our own home. They say that you are a fairly strong chess player, and any chess player knows that you can win only when you foresee several moves ahead. So, when we started perestroyka, did we foresee the difficulties that have now fallen down on our heads?

[Yakovlev] Both yes and no, all the same. Why yes? Let us start with the fact that perestroyka has become revolutionary, not only in the idea, not only in the doctrine, and not only in the concept, but in actual fact. We have called it a revolution. But if it is a revolution and not something else, that means that it will and must also be accompanied by difficulties and sudden changes in perceptions of it. In other words, I mean by this that, as for an understanding of the complexity of the turnaround, the social turnaround, and the creation of a new quality of society, if we are talking about that, then that understanding did exist, of course.

It is a different story when we begin to dissect the processes going on. A number of issues that can be described as unexpected do arise here. They are unexpected in various aspects, in both their acuteness and their prevalence, and in many other features. For example, I think that the country's political leadership did not know the depth of the precrisis condition that came to light in the economy. In other words, the economy was standing somewhere on an edge, beyond which a social explosion could have ensued. It is another matter that in the era of stagnation we were lucky to a certain degree, and unjustly perhaps; it was possible to trade in resources, as the prices were high, and to squander what had been obtained. That—I would call it money unearned by society compensated for the situation we had, made it possible to look around with indifference.

[Korzin] And created such an atmosphere [word indistinct]

[Yakovlev] And created an atmosphere of placidity, self-admiration, self-adulation, cults great and small, the calm of major and minor local princes, lawlessness, self-satisfaction and conceit—and everything, taken together, which we can describe as deformations of human morality, or in other words, deformations of the socialist way of life, the socialist way of life.

If we take other aspects of the question, conservatism, say, I can say frankly that both before 1985 and in 1985 it seemed to me—and as I now understand, it was a sort of romantic surge in psychology, founded perhaps on impatience with what had been, on a rejection of what had been and perhaps on a certain satisfaction that we could at last do something in society, to move it in the direction of democracy, glasnost, human freedom, and so on, and that romanticism may have prevented us from seeing the enormous stocks, reserves, and stores, I would call them, of psychology, reserves of conservatism, habits, dependence, hopes placed on somebody, but not on oneself, so to speak, hopes that there is somebody who will look after things, who will provide this, that, or the other—seemed to me that all that would be overcome right away somehow.

[Korzin] (?That everyone would understand right away.)

[Yakovlev] Look, in reality, can a person seriously think that lack of liberty is better than liberty?

[Korzin] Well, for many people quiet is better than movement.

[Yakovlev] Yes, movement, indeed, but at what cost? We have always grown accustomed, we want movement, we desire movement, we are in favor of it, we even welcome and applaud movement. But only as long as it takes place without me, so to speak. Who, then, who is moving it all? I'll see. This, to a great extent, is what is happening at the moment.

Where have today's complaints against the center heard at numerous meetings come from? They are not doing this, they are not doing that at the center. Apart from the desire to manipulate public opinion, and let me say, not very conscientiously, there is much here that also comes from the psychology that even now someone will arrive in some city and eliminate, say, crime. Or let us say a member of the Politburo, at the very least, will arrive in some other city and will sort out the heating there, let's say. After all, one of the tasks of perestroyka is the precise division of power, not only between the legislative, executive, and judicial, but also the firm division of the responsibilities of the center and the localities. But look how persistently the center wants to give power to the localities and how persistently people in some localities do not want to take it. Why?

One merely has to ask oneself the very simplest of questions: Why is it that people in the localities do not want to take on power when it would seem this is now possible? It is because now it has already become clear that power is now bound up with responsibility? Here lies the essence of this turning point, for this means responsibility for everything. It means responsibility for the baths and the hairdressers, for the roads and the housing, for food, and for order in the city in question.

[Korzin] On the other hand, it seems to me that precisely at the moment, one can look at a lot from the standpoint of a power struggle.

[Yakovlev] Yes, of course. There is nothing bad in this, on the whole. On the whole, perestroyka, as I see it, welcomes the fact that people who are capable of implementing power in a new way should come to power. I personally see nothing wrong with the desire in itself to come to power, to try one's strength and to satisfy one's healthy ambition. But when movement toward that power is conducted via speculative manipulation of public opinion, when it becomes a battle of vanity, ambition, and conceit, as well as a clash, a clash of some, well, some values and moralities different from good, charity, probity, and honesty, that, of course, is something that cannot fail to disturb one.

When there is this manipulation of public opinion over the genuine shortcomings that [changes thought] who was the first to talk about them? The country's leadership. As far back as the June plenum of the year before last, or perhaps even before, there was discussion of this unfortunate trio of ours—food, housing, and consumer goods. One could add to this the social atmosphere itself, health care, education, roads, and so on and so forth. When they talk and conduct this kind of onslaught against the existing perestroyka structures, against the perestroyka structures, or, if you like, against the transformations themselves, presenting the shortcomings as the results of those transformations, it is simply dishonest. This is something I simply want to state frankly, and people have to see these, this kind of manipulation. I personally believe that perestroyka is paying for the sins of others, and to a certain extent history is being—how can I put this? — unjust toward it. After all, was it perestroyka that created the housing situation? Or the food problem? Or, for example, the goods, the lack of consumer goods? Or the lack of hospitals, the neglected state of health care? Or else, for example, the country's road? Was it really restructuring that created this? Of course not. So someone has to pay for someone else's sins.

[Korzin] In general, it may be said that we are now living in fairly difficult circumstances. They say that the circumstances are beyond us. Evidently, in the current situation, the leadership of the country and the party often have to devote a substantial amount of time, and substantial attention to tactical matters, although of course one must not forget the strategy of where we are going and what our ultimate goal is.

[Yakovlev] Yes, indeed, there is now a great deal of discussion and various discussions about ideals, about the loss of ideals, which way are we—the question—where are we going, where have we gotten to? Probably all of this is par for the course. Then you can see (?if) society really is shaken up, and the creation of a new society is indeed in chaos. As a matter of fact I cannot even imagine very clearly whether this could have been any other way. In other words, since this is how it is, this is how it has to be.

When there is talk about the loss of the ideals of socialism, of society, and man, the question is not always asked, what are these ideals they talk about? What did these ideals comprise? Say, for example, the ideals based on the struggle against one's own people. Can this be a human ideal? No. Or let us say the ideal of levelling out. This inevitably leads to the levelling out of the personality, and not only to the levelling out of man's capabilities and to preventing capabilities from emerging, but even to the levelling out of his demands. Is this really the idea of a socialist society? Aren't man's competitiveness, creativity, and freedom in all respects ideals? I do not just mean the freedom to say something, but freedom from fear, freedom of development, and freedom of choice.

After all, speaking about the many deformations of that period we went through, for me personally, one of the essential things then was that man did not have freedom of choice. Therefore, perestroyka means for the moment the creation of the necessary preconditions. Let us not comfort ourselves that everything is proceeding in accordance with all the rules of a freely developing society. For now what is at issue is the development of the preconditions for providing man with freedom of choice. If I have freedom of choice, this means I have the freedom to build my state the way I want, to build my economy, build all my social structures and to choose the path in life in this diversity of choices that meets my intellectual demands and gives me inner satisfaction, which is perhaps the most important thing for man.

[Korzin] Throughout our long history, it was the press that was blamed. If crops failed to be harvested, it was because newspapers had not published enough mobilizing articles. If some decision is not popular, it is the press that has failed to explain things clearly. It seems to me that especially lately the criticism of us journalists has increased. We are being criticized and blamed for almost all the troubles. Well, it is understandable. It is somewhat inconvenient, for example, for economic managers just as for leaders of ministries and departments to be permanently under close scrutiny. Here is my question in this connection: Does not all this create a real threat to glasnost and will we not make a sharp turn to the right under all this pressure of circumstances and opinions?

[Yakovlev] I don't think so. I believe it is quite simply impossible to turn public life to the right. Such a system of irreversibility has appeared in perestroyka. Even in the most difficult place, in human consciousness, in the human skull. So that it is quite simply impossible to turn it to the right. Quite impossible. The more so, since the past is lying in wait for us on the right. You won't overtake progress on the right. If at all, progess can only be overtaken on the left, if one can use such a metaphor.

[Korzin, laughing] Perhaps catch up would be better?

[Yakovlev] I might just correct that thought, for I have just remembered a very wise expression of Saltykov-Shchedrin's, when he said of a man that he was always trying to run ahead of progress. A situation not unknown to us, incidentally. There are such people at the moment. Which is only natural, I suppose. You see, the way I view it, if we are speaking of glasnost and the press, then in my opinion, there is some misunderstanding, a genuine misunderstanding that stems from the unexpectedness, the unexpected surge, of the freedom of the press, from the variety of topics and devices in journalism, from the way issues are phrased. In actual fact, when society moves from having no voice and no power to glasnost and democracy, that is some shock, and it cannot fail to induce a state of shock. All the same, one must now, well, dissect the processes—dissect and understand them, and start to comprehend their internal essence, sort objectively through the chaos of views, to see where they stem from and what their nature is, subjective or objective.

Where, for instance, does that curse of any revolution—leftism, which verges on destructivism—come from? By that I mean the part of leftism that is akin to destructivism. It doesn't matter what is being destroyed, the party or leasing or a law or a human being, or the leadership, particularly. It doesn't matter what comes to hand. Or what lies behind that cheerless yet terrible conservatism, whose inertia plagues us to this very day, oppressing and hampering us, alarming and tormenting us? That dangerous conservatism. From time to time it surfaces at mass meetings, and becomes a little frightening. When people say let me try steering, I always close my eyes and wonder whether they are actually saying let me take a pot-shot. Here, too, then there must be a good deal more investigation on society's part. That sort of populism is always lacking a constructive program—that's good, that's lacking, that's bad—but what should be done to rectify this?

[Korzin] I would like to distance myself from the question of what should be done and recall one of your favorite expressions: lose your faith and you lose everything. I would like to apply it to a question about the party. You will, of course, know that there has been an upsurge in the number of people leaving the party. Criticism of it is intensifying. Does it not seem to you that we are still doing more talking than anything else to renew the party? What do you think? What has to be done for the party to prove its renewal by action?

[Yakovlev] It must work. Work. There is a certain paradox here that has to do with the psychology of perception and assessment. The paradox is that it is being said that the party is losing authority and trust, but when I have a spare moment, I am always thinking, what about the time when the struggle between the Stalinist leadership and its entourage, on the one hand, and the people, on the other, was going on? The repressions, the execution of innocent people. Did the party really build up its prestige? If it did, then that is terrible. Then there were the years of stagnation, when we preached a dual or even treble code of ethics, when we behaved like artful dodgers and had an easy-going attitude toward the black market, when we regarded bribetaking and the degradation of society with equanimity. Did that really bolster the party? That is terrible.

The question is raised, who benefited from all that? Presumably those people who are loudest in shouting that the party's prestige is waning, that it is a blow to the party, and so on and so forth. Some people really are speaking of a decline in its prestige, but I keep wondering if this is the case. I am not wholly convinced that this really is a scientifically sociological cross-section of society's mood. More and more it seems to me that people are now talking, or are inclined to talk, about this from the point of view of personalities. From both sides. What do I mean by that? Someone is defeated at the election and claims that is a blow at the party; immediately he off-loads his personal defeat on the whole party.

Second, of course, there are still many officials who by their activities, pure and simple, have lost prestige. But they are the ones who have lost it. There are still very many examples of both the rayon and oblast party committees enjoying both prestige and respect. There are individuals who are heeded, who speak out, and who really are ready to take responsibility for actions taken. Why is it that in these cases we do not say that the party's prestige is increasing? We regard this as normal and right! It is perfectly normal when a person works properly and is heeded properly. These things to do with personality should not be transferred when somebody really has fallen out of the carriage of history for one reason or another, when he couldn't work properly before either, when he is petrified of people like the plague and cannot talk to them, when he just cannot break the years-old habit of conceit and arrogance, and of dividing people up into them and us.

Who are they and who are we? Presumably we are those who are possessed of some truth, who believe ourselves to be Jesus Christ, and who are omniscient. Meanwhile they are the masses who are starting to lay down the law, don't you know! You come across utterances of the type: I'm not going to be under the thumb of that throng! How has this come about? Where is it from? That is where we need to look, and that is where we need to restructure: Who are we? We used to say we were the flesh of the people's flesh, the people's mind, honor, and conscience. Then let us be its mind, honor, and conscience! Let us actually be the flesh of the people's flesh! It is said that the wave of perestroyka has broken and is now ebbing, but I don't believe that. If that is the case, then we have undertaken a false cause. That would mean we had made a mistake. I would not want to go along with that on a factual, psychological, or political level.

In a revolution rebounding is a terrible thing. Any rebound is a thermidor. This is what experience teaches us. Perhaps it will not happen, but this is precisely what historical experience teaches. We are hardly an exception to the rule. This is something that society has to think about, everyone has to think about it, but I repeat, I don't see here—not because I want to console myself with some bogus optimistic thoughts or ideas—no. [sentence incomplete as heard] Perestroyka is advancing. Just look at the legislative work of the Supreme Soviet. One law after another is being debated and adopted and they are changing the whole nature of production relations and will in the end force or arouse productive forces. The structure of the economy is changing; it is addressing itself to people's needs. All this is now a sort of piggy-bank creating capital for perestroyka. But it has to be managed soberly, calmly, and sensibly; this capital must not be wasted on unnecessary disputes, squabbling, mutual accusations, and other manifestations of arrogance.

Generally speaking, we began perestroyka with the economy, realizing that this was a deep and complex affair and in the most neglected state. We assumed that by the time we arrived at the political reform the economy would have begun to move and would be functioning a bit better, but that has not happened. So far, the economic structures are easily absorbing things, but not yielding them, by virtue of their chronic nature, by nature of the fact that they have not come together with the political reform and are not yet under democratic control. This is the contradiction, this is what constitutes the contradiction of the present stage. Indeed the democratic structures have not yet fully taken shape—the elections to the local bodies still lie ahead. Eventually the localities, the local soviets, will have to assume responsibility for affairs in their region. I think this will also stabilize the situation, it seems to me. The process of renewal is not yet completed within the party. The congress has to have its decisive say, so to speak, at the present stage of historical development, on what the party should be like under these circumstances. Clearly it has to perform the role of a political vanguard, but how, in what way, by what methods? Where is the mechanism that will function in precisely the way that it will be the political vanguard? The political vanguard. All this has to be thought over, all these issues have to be addressed, and what is more, with considerable exertion of intellectual, political, and social imagination, so to speak, apart from everything else. The main thing is to see and watch attentively how the democratic, economic, and social affairs structures born of perestroyka itself are actually forming in real life.

[Korzin] A final question, Aleksandr Nikolayevich. You actually have a big family. You have grandchildren already.

[Yakovlev] Yes, I do.

[Korzin] How many?

[Yakovlev] Four.

[Korzin, chuckling] You're a wealthy grandfather!

[Yakovlev] Yes, you're right.

[Korzin] Like any normal person, you naturally canot fail to think about their future, about what awaits them, about what kinds of lives they will live. When you reflect on that future, do you do so with optimism? If so, what is your optimism based on?

[Yakovlev] You know, I really am an optimist, especially now. I really believe in perestroyka and I really believe in the need for the reforms that are under way. I really see that for our society all this is a means of salvation. I really see that democracy that is developed in the right way, is correctly understood, and is based on man's freedom and the freedom of the individual, on his discipline and self-discipline, on his consciousness and his self-awareness, on his broad and deep sense of morality, can become the engine behind our social progress, in all directions. I believe that everything else is important but secondary. It is only through developing democracy that it will be possible to obtain a self-regulating and self-renewing society, itself capable of advancing due to its internal mechanisms of renewal and self-renewal.

On the same wave of optimism—though I understand all the difficulties—it is precisely optimism, I think, that helps one to look deeper at the blunders, miscalculations, and shortcomings we make and have, for optimism also means responsibility. This is not just to do with a Christian understanding of good of some kind or indifference toward what surrounds one. I regard optimism as man's active force, a force based on his interests, and if you wish, an offensive force that obliges one to be responsible. Therefore, proceeding from these thoughts and considerations, I believe in the future of my country. Now, too, we are going through great times. It is just that we do not yet know it. It's always this way (?with mankind)—only in retrospect do we understand various periods of history. Transferring this to the plane of personalities, I think that perhaps the lives of our children will not be as stormy. Perhaps no doubt, they will live a different life with different dimensions, approaches, thoughts, assessments, etc, but still I think that in the future society will be kinder, more charitable, and will have a greater conscience. If my grandchildren master these qualities in the context of the whole society, of course, then one can say mankind still has hope, still has hope. There is no other way, as the saying goes.

[Korzin] Thank you for the interesting conversation.

[Yakovlev] Thanks.

[Korzin] Thank you.

Resolution of Leningrad Rally Cited

PM2711170189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Molokov report: "Background to Rally: Leningraders' Position"]

[Excerpt] Leningrad—"There is no alternative to perestroyka. The whole point is who wants to turn it in what direction." That alarming thought expressed in the report by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee [Obkom] and City Committee [Gorkom], at the joint plenum was categorically and clearly resolved at a citywide rally of Communists on 22 November. "For the Socialist Aims of Perestroyka" was its slogan. The 20,000-plus participants firmly declared: "No to anti-Leninism! No to private ownership! We will not let perestroyka be used to hit communism!"

I think that it can be confidently stated that the city on the Neva has seen nothing like it since 1917. Communists had their say in defense of communist ideals and said it firmly, with conviction, and for all to hear. Yes, sometimes the emotions generated by the ideas at the rally overstepped the mark, sometimes the words and expressions were not very well chosen, and perhaps not every speaker clearly understood how to estimate the forces, for example, required for implementation of the new line that the Leningrad CPSU Obkom is maintaining—here, of course, a rally decision is not enough. But a rally is a rally, it has its own dynamism, its own passion, and its own style. Leningrad's Communists were sincere. The Smolnyy Institute has been receiving telegrams from different cities in the country and each of them expresses support for the Leningrad Communists' position and platform. Here are some of them:

"I wholeheartedly support the Leningraders' resolution. Perfilyeva, Moscow."

"I support the platform of the Communists from the city of Lenin, the cradle of the revolution. Keep it up! P. Ignatov, party member since 1961, Moscow."

"Leningraders, people of Peter's city, we delight in your example in the struggle for Lenin's party. Advance more

boldly. Fedor Yevteyev, CPSU member since 1941, and my many Muscovite friends. Moscow."

"Bravo, Leningraders! Keep it up! Trubinov from Nizhniy Tagil."

"Thank you! Be firm, Communists of Leningrad! Chernova, Moscow."

"We are stunned by the boldness, topicality, skillfulness, timeliness, and constructiveness of the Leningraders' party platform.... Sapelnikov and Krivtsov, Moscow."

Clearly, the Leningrad Communists' rally did not receive everyone's approval. There are other views of it, too. But the rally defined its position clearly and that must be taken into account.

Many of the telegrams and telephone calls ask for the resolution adopted at the rally to be published. The resolution itself adopted at the rally also mentioned this.

Resolution of the rally of Leningrad Communists. We Leningrad Communists believe that the development of events in our country has reached a critical point.

The crisis in the economic and social spheres is deepening, the black economy is gaining momentum, and speculators are finding refuge in the cooperative system. The working people's living standard has fallen sharply. The brunt of the consequences of ill-considered decisions and erroneous actions rests on the shoulders of workers and peasants and the low-income groups of the population. An active campaign is under way in favor of private ownership of the means of production. Inflation is increasing, social and labor discipline are declining, and the crime rate is rising. The prestige of institutions of state power and working people's faith in their ability to turn the situation around and halt the slide toward anarchy have fallen perceptibly. This is having an adverse impact on the course of preparations for elections to the union republic Supreme Soviets and local soviets.

Against the background of crisis phenomena in the economy, the increasing degradation of the spiritual sphere is obvious. A hustler's culture has developed. Bourgeois ideology and morality are being introduced into society and the honor and dignity of our fathers and grandfathers are being impugned. The blood of innocent people is being shed in a number of regions of the country because of interethnic conflicts.

Newfound pseudodemocrats, some of them with party cards, are attacking the party, distorting its history, belittling its role and place in the socialist political system, and artificially setting the party against the soviets and the people. They have on their side certain newspapers, magazines, and television programs which use the slogan of socialist pluralism as a cover to monopolize the right to shape public opinion and effectively transform themselves into an instrument of media terror. Unless a CPSU Central Committee Plenum provides an assessment of this phenomenon, we shall consider it necessary to hold a partywide debate on this question.

Leningrad's Communists cannot stand aside from the events that are taking place.

Eradicating the deformations and distortions caused in the building of our society by Stalinism and stagnation, we shall struggle persistently for a renewed socialism. It is only in renewed socialism that we see the future of our great motherland—the USSR.

We categorically oppose the various plans which propose in effect to restore the bourgeois system in our country, to resurrect private ownership, and to revive exploitation of man by man.

We demand the adoption of immediate emergency measures to stabilize the political and economic situation in the state and to really raise people's living standards. More action—less talk!

We summon everyone to highly organized, conscientious labor—the main source of the people's prosperity.

We support democracy but not anarchy, we support discipline and responsibility and the security of every Soviet family.

We support historical truth, not lies and distortions.

We support the creation of a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] party organization, but at the same time reject the idea of transforming the CPSU into a confederation of union republic parties.

We Leningrad Communists have defined our position and count on support for that position from the union republic communist parties and the party organizations of RSFSR krays and oblasts. We expect the same from the CPSU Central Committee.

We demand:

—That an enlarged plenum of the CPSU Central Committee be held to hear reports from members of the Politburo and assess the political situation in the party and the country;

—That the existing procedure of multistage elections of delegates to party conferences and congresses be abolished and that direct elections of delegates by primary party organizations be envisaged...

Leningraders, both Communists and nonparty people, let us close ranks for the sake of the renewal of socialism! History will not forgive us if we are indifferent and inactive.

Our banner was and remains the Red Banner, and on it will be inscribed the words: Lenin, October, socialism! [Resolution ends; passage omitted citing comments by rally participants]

New Moscow Party Chief Views First Tasks

PM2411164789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russia 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, by P. Gutiontov under the rubric "Names and Events": "Yu. Prokofyev: I Appeal to Muscovites for Their Support"; date, place not given; first three paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The 21 November Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom] Plenum elected Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev as its first secretary.

He is 50. He has been a CPSU member since 1960. He is a graduate of the Moscow Automotive Mechanics Institute and the Moscow Higher Party School. He is a candidate of economic sciences.

His career has taken him from All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] rayon committee instructor to chief of the Moscow Komsomol Gorkom, and then into party work. He was elected secretary of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee in 1986, and became a Moscow CPSU Gorkom secretary and then second secretary more than a year ago.

[Gutiontov] Yuriy Anatolyevich, which of the future difficulties inevitably awaiting you in your job will be the hardest? Incidentally, whereas before the Moscow Gorkom was headed by at least a candidate Politburo member, you aren't even a Central Committee member...

[Prokofyev] No, I'm not a Central Committee member, and I have no experience of work on a state scale such as all my predecessors had. That, of course will cause certain difficulties. But I specially stressed at the plenum (for some reason this phrase did not appear in the TASS report) that I expect the support of Muscovites—workers and intelligentsia—in resolving all the most important problems facing us. And if such support is forthcoming, that will be a substitute for my lack of titles.

[Gutiontov] The plenum "broke" with yet another tradition, by which the Moscow Gorkom first secretary isn't usually a native Muscovite. You are a native Muscovite—a fact of which I am sure you fellow-citizens will approve. On the other hand, you don't have the advantage of taking a "fresh look" at things, so to speak—during your years of work in the city's party and soviet organs you could have grown somewhat accustomed to the capital's sore points and problems (which are not getting any fewer, unfortunately). What will the priorities of your future policy be? Which of the city's priority problems will you use the weight of the organization you head to solve?

[Prokofyev] The main thing is to consolidate all constructive forces which are truly interested in improving our life. I think that the city is now in a certain state of neglect, owing to a lack of patriotism and love of the city and because of the indifference to and toleration of the problems which you mentioned. Breaking through this indifference at all levels is one of the most important tasks for the party organization.

But, above all, we must end confrontation. This is quite possible. For instance, I recently chatted with the first secretary of Oktyabrskiy Rayon Committee. He said that an association of voters' clubs had been set up in the rayon to include all such clubs, wherever they are set up. I think this is a very positive step.

[Gutiontov] Could you briefly describe today's sociopolitical situation in the capital?

[Prokofyev] I would not call it entirely favorable or stable. The upsurge in rally democracy, the 100-150,000 participants in rallies, and their intolerance and tough stances speak for themselves... Although, I repeat, we are feeling our way toward certain paths to consolidation. We need to work—together!—in all avenues without exception.

[Gutiontov] Many people are now saying that the party's prestige (and, to an even greater extent, party workers' prestige) needs to be not so much strengthened as restored. How do you think this can be done?

[Prokofyev] I think that in order to boost the party's prestige we need, above all, a resolute democratization of the party itself so as to ensure that the processes of renewal taking place within the party do not lag behind the processes taking place in society as a whole. The second point is that we need results from perestroyka right away in order to restore people's hope that the party and the soviets are capable of actually solving the problems facing the country. Without this, we won't be able to boost our prestige.

[Gutiontov] What's your attitude to the proposals to hold elections for party congress delegates by direct balloting of communists?

[Prokofyev] I have already discussed this: We are now working within the framework of the existing Statutes, and nobody has yet rescinded them. But we in the party gorkom are now working on three versions which are close to the proposal you mentioned.

[Gutiontov] You have taken over the leadership of the gorkom at quite a complex time—on the threshold of the elections to republic and local soviets. What experience from the spring campaign do you think should be utilized? Not least personal experience: After all, you yourself were unsuccessful in the last election... One other thing: What's your attitude to the idea of electing deputies from production okrugs?

[Prokofyev] You know, I supported the idea of elections from production okrugs, and for the following reasons. Certain comrades are afraid that such elections will make it possible for officials from the party and soviet apparatus to "infiltrate" the soviets. But in that case only people working at a given enterprise should be eligible for election from those okrugs—then the problem would be solved. We have areas in Moscow, you understand, where the number of residents is considerably lower than the number of people who work there. And the interests of both sides need to be balanced and combined in some way. We are currently testing this idea in two Moscow rayons. We'll see how it goes. If production okrugs prove their worth—fine. If not, we'll abandon them. But the fundamental approach is that it doesn't matter where candidates are nominated or who nominates them. The only thing that matters is for honest and competent people with an active life stance to be elected.

[Gutiontov] And what about the lessons...

[Prokofyev] I think we learned two main lessons. We were certain that since there was only one party in the country there would be no political struggle in elections. But the democratization process has already revealed a considerable range of different views and approaches to the resolution of problems, and many politicized associations have emerged. We had to prepare ourselves for an active dialogue with them, and to explain and defend our positions. We could not even conduct the proper agitation work with regard to the Central Committee appeal, as a result of which many of these politicized associations lifted many provisions from it and propagandized them as their own. The second lesson is that during the elections we got into confrontation on the lines that, if candidates were not "ours," they had to be opposed. This produced a highly negative reaction from the voters and predetermined our defeat to a considerable extent.

[Gutiontov] You stressed at the plenum that the traditions and style of the city party organization and the gorkom would be maintained and developed. Just what traditions and style did you have in mind?

[Prokofyev] I was thinking of the main thing: party comradeship, respect for each other, support, and benevolence. That, I believe, has been our style. No pressure from above—be it on rayon or primary organizations—and no hard-line instructions, which used to be very widespread. Admittedly, this has sometimes produced a certain amount of confusion: Many people have gotten used to having everything dictated to them. And they have interpreted the independence granted to them as an attempt by the gorkom simply to avoid making decisions.

[Gutiontov] Yuriy Anatolyevich, you have just started your first working day in your new job and, judging by everything, I am the first journalist you have received in this office. What has this working day been like?

[Prokofyev] I started by meeting leaders of health organs, and just before meeting with you I was talking with the chief of the city internal affairs administration: The rising crime problem must be eliminated in an exceedingly short time. Now I'm meeting with you, and later I'll be dealing with cadre questions. For instance, we now have a vacancy for the gorkom second secretary's job, and I think that this question will be discussed quite democratically. Then I have a meeting scheduled with the leaders of Moscow TV: They took advantage of yesterday's press conference to ask me to receive them so as to discuss their problems and difficulties. Tomorrow morning I'm going to Butovo; that territory has just been incorporated into Moscow and is in a very serious condition... Actually, just 2 weeks ago I took part in an urban development council meeting as second secretary, and the Butovo residents invited me to make a point of visiting them...

[Gutiontov] Our interview is going to be headed up by a relatively dry biographical summary of the new Moscow CPSU Gorkom first secretary's career. What events in your life would you yourself pick out as being the most important?

[Prokofyev] I don't think I can say anything original. As far as events go—the main event, of course, happened the day before yesterday at the plenum: The choice made by my comrades came as a surprise to me, to be honest. The second event was the birth of my grandson. First I went to work, then I studied, then my wife started her studies... We just didn't realize that we were about to become grandparents...

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Opens 2-Day Session

LD2811074689 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, the largest of the fifteen union republics, opened its two-day session at the Grand Kremlin Palace today.

The republican state plan for economic and social development and the budget for 1990 are on the agenda. These documents have been drawn up in difficult economic crisis conditions. Session will therefore also discuss specific measures to improve the economy, consolidate the republican money circulation and deepen economic reform.

Azerbaijan National Front Announces 10-Day Strike

NC2811094889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 28 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] It was reported last night that the Azerbaijan National Front has decided to call a 10-day strike. This primarily means a blockade and all its consequences.

Immediately after receiving the report, the newspaper's correspondents went to the Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasus Railway and talked on the phone with all the (?major) rayon, raykom, and internal affairs departments, all of which confirmed the (?report).

Under the title of [word indistinct] blockade, the newspaper carries the report, which says that with the [words indistinct] received from Yerevan Railway Station, people were in a confused state. They approached the (?information source). [Words indistinct] that the Kapan-Yerevan and the Baku-Yerevan trains had left on time but were already between 8 and 10 hours overdue at Yerevan. They say that the passenger trains were stopped on the (?Julfa) route.

Rail Transport Affected

AU2811111489 Paris AFP in English 1041 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, Nov 28 (AFP)—A new strike has hit the southern Soviet republic of Azerbaijan, paralyzing much of the rail traffic in the region and several factories in Baku, according to press reports here Tuesday. The strike, reportedly called by the nationalist Popular Front on Saturday, aims to pressure the government into ending Moscow rule of Nagorno-Karabakh, a mostly Armenian enclave inside Azerbaijan.

A number of rail depots have been affected by the strike, including those at Baladjari, Kirovobad and Jolfa [place names as received]. All good trains were at a standstill, GUDOK, the railways newspaper, said Tuesday. Much of the rail traffic with Iran was stopped at the Jolfa border crossing, and only passenger trains were running elsewhere.

Railways Minister Nikolay Konarev has appealed to the rail employees to return to work, GUDOK said. The Soviet parliament in October adopted emergency legislation designed to ban all stoppages in essential services, including transport.

The strike is due to continue until Wednesday when a meeting will be held in Baku to decide whether it should be extended, according to Radio Moscow news digest. [passage omitted]

More on Rail Disruptions

NC2811110489 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 28 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Valeriy Vartanyan writes that members of the Azerbaijan National Front stopped the Yerevan-Norashen-[name indistinct] train loaded with cargo at (Veligrad) station and tried to turn it back [word indistinct]. Also, with the [word indistinct] on the Idzhevan rail route [words indistinct], on 26 November the Azerbaijan National Front stopped the Yerevan-Kapan train at Nakhichevan's (Mindzhevan) station. The correspondent poses several questions on the [word indistinct] of the Azerbaijan National Front.

Journalist Denies Azeri Train Vandalism

90US0206A Baku MOLODEZH AZERBAYDZHANA in Russian 21 Oct 89 p 3

[Article by special correspondent of the AZERI INFORMATION AGENCY V. Shulman: "Vandalism on the Railroad: Who is Responsible?"]

[Text] Employees of the Main Administration of Internal Affairs for Transportation and an AZERINFORM [AZERI INFORMATION AGENCY] correspondent played the unusual role of "violators" of the movement of trains through the station of Derbent to the Azerbaijan Railroad. Having stopped several trains which were en route to Armenia from the North Caucasus Main Line they decided to verify the condition of the freight in the cars.

This joint action undertaken by the AZERINFORM with the cooperation of the Azeri Administration of Internal Affairs for Transportation refutes the accusations leveled by some central newspapers and in the speeches of deputies at the 2d Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the effect that trains with freight for Armenia are subjected to looting while traveling through the territory of Azerbaijan. However, the facts testify otherwise. Indeed, 200 families who suffered during the earthquake in the neighboring republic will have to postpone their housewarming parties for a long time. After all, this is exactly how many ransacked [preassembled] homes were found on the trains at the station of Derbent, the contact point between the North Caucasian and Azerbaijan Railroads by the employees of the commercial inspections checkpoint together with the representatives of the transportation militia and the Azerinform.

This was not a pleasant sight. The windows and doors of the houses were broken; electrical wires were torn; linoleum had cuts on it; wallpaper was peeled off; plumbing fixtures were bent out of shape. This enumeration of what we saw at the Derbent station is far from complete. This is the situation on many tracks where trains en route to Transcaucasia are parked. Representatives of the inspection team found cars with seals torn off, damaged technological equipment, opened and even ransacked containers.

Naturally, the facts of vandalism were reflected in dry militia protocols and commercial notes taken by railroad employees. However, what is to be done with the homes in which it is impossible to live, as Militia Lieutenant Colonel Anatoliy Dumanov, senior commissioner of the department for combating criminal infringements on freight which operates at the Main Administration, observed. After all, they are earmarked for people who have lost their housing and who are awaiting a move to new premises at present, on the eve of the winter.

"What do you mean—what is to be done?" asks back deputy chief of the Makhachkala Division of the North

Caucasian Railroad V. Yashin. "Carry the houses further on, to Armenia. We are not in a position to interrupt the movement here, at the station of Derbent. The station is a contact point between two railroads, ours and the Azerbaijan Railroad, and it is clogged to begin with due to the rapid increase in the stream of freight to Transcaucasia. Any disruption, any extra operation of uncoupling cars means a delay, a new jam in the path of trains. There is nothing surprising about it: We encounter similar instances of hooliganism and theft every day. Incidentally, they occur not on our section alone. They plunder and break the cars with freight not only for Armenia but also for other Transcaucasian republics. The criminals are not selective; they are just criminals."

It is possible to acknowledge the explanations of a specialist but it is hard to understand them. After all, if we follow his reasoning, the railroad employees provide no guarantee of safety of the freight. How long is this going to last? How long is the Azerbaijan Railroad going to be "saddled" with all the blame for its safety—the railroad which is forced to continuously explain itself because of someone else's transgressions and robbery committed at other railroads of the country?

The AZERINFORM correspondent heard on location unintelligible answers to the questions asked, as well as the comments of transportation militia employees who fail to understand why they have to take over for the railroad employees in checking the safety of the freight. What do they think about all of it at the USSR Ministry of Railroads in which the rapid turnaround of cars rather than the safety of freight is still considered to be the main performance indicator? During the several hours of our visit to Derbent we inspected 10 trains. This is more than 500 cars. I venture that more than 100 of them were ransacked still before Derbent. This is why mangled cars and homes continue arriving on the Azerbaijan Railroad.

Azerbaijani Law on Sovereignty Discussed

NC2711085589 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] The constitutional laws of a sovereign republic can only be changed on the basis of a referendum by the people of that republic. Correspondent Mikhail Ibragimov discusses the matter:

[Begin recording] [Ibragimov] The recently adopted constitutional law of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR can be described as embodying the hope that we might be moving in the direction of realizing our [word indistinct] wish. It is the sacred duty of all our people to obstruct the attempt made by [words indistinct], who wish to undermine this hope. A claim has been put forward on the basis of a (?presentation) by the USSR Ministry of Justice, which views our justified endeavor with doubt, to the effect that several norms in the legislative provisions of the Azerbaijan SSR's Constitution conflict with the USSR Constitution and terms of the USSR's international agreements, and that in view of this they cannot be effective in our republic's territory.

Our people have objected to the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in that regard. In fact, they are debating it in detail at the present time.

Dear listeners, we interviewed (?Kabul) Kuliyev, deputy director of the Scientific Affairs Department of the Azerbaijan SSR Institute of Economics and candidate of economic sciences, on the matter:

[Kuliyev] It is natural that some of the legislative rights of the union republics, including the Azerbaijan SSR, may conflict with the USSR Constitution at a time when reconstruction is (?broadening). This is due to the fact that the USSR Constitution itself does not meet contemporary sovereignty (?requirements). It is no coincidence that the USSR Supreme Soviet has created a committee under Gorbachev to deal with the question of the changes to be effected in the USSR Constitution. I believe that at a time when democratization is spreading to all areas of our life and an effort is being made to establish the independence of individual republics, [words indistinct], the USSR Constitution must comply with the (?constitutions of the republics). The constitutions of the republics must reflect the traditions and customs of the local peoples, [words indistinct], and individual peoples, which have been formed [words indistinct]. Furthermore, they must be included in the USSR Constitution. I believe that the establishment of the independence of the republics is an important aspect of reconstruction. Furthermore, it seems to me that discussing the economic independence of any sovereign state prior to establishing its political independence is only a waste of time.

[Ibragimov] How can it be possible to explain that we are justified in objecting to the application of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's view to the Azerbaijan SSR's Constitution?

[Kuliyev] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decision, notably its second provision that the legislative rights of the union republics conflict with the USSR Constitution, has the characteristics of an administrative order, reminiscent of Stalin's era and the stagnation period. The supreme soviet presidiums of the republics have been recommended to take appropriate measures to align their legislative rights with the USSR Constitution. Our constitutional law was drawn up in accordance with the wishes and demands of the peoples who live in the republic after it had been debated by them. In view of this, the legislative rights which have been adopted can only be changed through a referendum; that is, after the views of the people have been established. [end recording]

Armenian Elections To Be Held in Early 1990

NC2611124189 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 25 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet will take place at the beginning of the next year. They will be held under new regulations, in line with the amendments to the Constitution and election law.

There is an extremely heated debate in Armenia concerning the election of the person who will assume the highest office in the republic. By law that person is the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

There is an another way to elect this person; however, it has not been presented for public debate. This alternative is the direct election of the president of the republic, an option with strong supporters and adamant opponents.

The opponents argue that the people are not mature enough to tackle such a serious problem. This is the spirit of old thinking from the infamous past. These opponents argue that a president with extensive mandates could abuse his power and take a stand against the Supreme Soviet.

However, these people forget that it is not the elected representatives of the people who abuse their power, but those who reach the height of authority under patronage and through complicity and machinations. It is necessary that the people and its elected leader find, know, and understand each other, and unite.

Vorkuta Miners' 'Latest' Demands Noted

PM2711155589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "In the Pechora Coalfield": "Endless Ultimatums"]

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]), 24 Nov—A tense situation prevails at the "Vorgashorskaya" mine, largest in the Pechora coalfield, whose collective is still on strike today. The other coal mining enterprises in Vorkuta are operating.

The "Vorgashorskaya" mine is putting forward new categorical demands whose fulfillment is specified as a mandatory condition for possibly stopping the strike in this coal mining enterprise. Amongthe latest are: giving the Vorkuta miners specific documents about the decisions taken at the 17 November meeting with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, where the progress in fulfilling USSR government Resolution No 608 was examined; the annulment of the Komi ASSR Supreme Court decisions ruling the present strike at a number of mines in the "Vorkutaugol" association illegal; and the establishment and arrival in Vorkuta of a government commission empowered to resolve the miners' questions at local level.

The Pechora coalfield miners and other people living in the Komi ASSR are acquainting themselves with an interview published today in the republican newspaper KRASNOYE ZNAMYA, given to that newspaper by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Talking about the results of the meeting with representatives of the coalfields' labor collectives, the head of the USSR Government stressed that the main concern now is to organize what was agreed and to organize the work. The miners must work calmly, and give the government time to work calmly. Only in this way can the problems be solved.

Atmosphere at Vorkuta Pit Viewed

PM2811093389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Viktor Filipov dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Month-Long Strike"]

[Text] Vorkuta—The "Vorgashorskaya" Mine had been on strike for a full month on 25 November. A strange pace of life prevails at this mine, the largest in the Pechora Coalfield.

The strike committee allows access to the mine only to those people without whom it will simply have to shut down. Most of the underground team of workers—up to 300 persons per shift—stay "on the surface." Order in the mine is maintained in the settlement's wine store, where people play dominoes, smoke, or watch television...

A large light screen has been installed in the lobby of the administrative block. The figures displayed on it are depressing. The extraction shortfall during the strike has reached about 400,000 tonnes of coal, fines amounting to over R1.5 million have accumulated, and the collective has lost almost as much from its wages fund. The mine does not have a single ruble to its credit. Where is the money coming from to pay the wages of those who are working?

I had a look in the offices of the administration and management personnel. It is strange: There is no coal, but they are scribbling away.

"We are working on contracts with consumers of our coal and a draft document on relations between the mine as an autonomous legal entity and the association," Director Petr Yermakov explained. "The strike can't last forever, after all. Here on my desk, I have an order from the minister on the mine's transition to full economic accountability. When? Whenever we are ready to work autonomously."

"Will you be able to manage to start a new life with pockets that have been emptied by the strike?"

"The mine is in working condition, we'll be able to reach full capacity in a couple of days."

People crowd the strike committee's tiny room around the clock. They are there to receive every telephone call from Moscow from their emissaries working on the commission which is clarifying USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608 and to tape their reports.

The office of Party Committee Secretary Anatoliy Kiforenko is never vacant, either—news from the capital is also taped there, but it originates from coordination council delegates. This unsponsored organization of Vorkuta mines' representatives was formed at the end of October on the initiative of "Vorgashorskaya" Mine's party committee. The coordination council believes that miners' demands can be upheld without striking.

Two information centers—two positions. The fact that they are diametrically opposed can be seen at the meetings held in the assembly hall for every shift of miners. The following news was reported from Moscow, for example: The delegation visited a deputy general prosecutor who confirmed that nobody has any intention of prosecuting participants in the strike and that mine administrations have been authorized not to apply disciplinary or other measures against them. This was how the news was reported by party committee members. But a strike committee representative offered it in a different form to the meeting: The Prosecutor's Office has made a condition—you won't be punished if you report for work before 23 November.

The 10-day period set at the meeting between miners and the government for the preparation of documents expires Monday 27 November. What will the next week bring to Vorkuta?

Leaders' Intolerance Blamed for Mine Strike

PM2711170989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 p 2

[G. Sazonov report: "Vorkuta 25 November: There, at the Coal Mine... Official Leaders Replaced by Unofficial Leaders. But Are They Concerned About Workers' Interests?"]

[Text] The "Vorgashorskaya" Mine. It is the youngest and the best-equipped mine in the Pechora coalfield. And the largest—it extracts 6 million tonnes of coal a year. Its rated capacity has long been exceeded. Its cheapest coal costs R13 per tonne. The line of people waiting here for housing is the longest among Vorkuta's mines—1,200 people.

"Vorgashorskaya" is the most rebellious mine. For a whole month now more than 3,500 people have not been working here.

Passions are seething at the meeting hall. People are making speeches and listening to a tape recorder. Not hit records but a recording of telephone conversations with USSR People's Deputies Andrey Sakharov and Yuriy Vlasov. Ardent appeals from Vladimir Ivanov, leader of the Russian People's Front, are also carried on the loudspeakers. Those gathered here applaud the unexpected visitors to "Vorgashorskaya," who are fighting for a strike "to the finish."

Yesterday Anatoliy Kiforenko, young secretary of the mine party committee, told me how he tried to master the situation. He read cables out to the miners from the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the USSR Council of Ministers saying that no penalties would be applied against the strikers. "We don't believe that!" They did not even listen to Valentin Kopasov, cochairman of the Vorkuta municipal strike committee: "We won't go underground until Guridov tells us!"

"We ourselves are just as tired of the strike," Stepan Shutskiy, a breakage face miner, acknowledged. "But there's no going back. We demand concrete documents and dates for the fulfillment of various points in the resolution drawn up by the government and the responsible people. We are perfectly well aware that this cannot be settled in a day. But timeframes must be determined and someone must take responsibility for that. What else annoys us? High-ranking leaders say that countless quantities of food and industrial goods have been sent to Vorkuta, but that is not true!"

Some 20 minutes by car and then you are in the settlement of Stroitelnyy. We set off along a snow-covered road to a storage hut built in 1956. There, in a small room 20 square meters, Vladimir Voronin, his wife, and his grown-up son, who is also a miner, live with permafrost underfoot... They have stove heating: "We sleep in sweat suits, because the room is cold by morning." They have virtually no hope of obtaining well-equipped housing—and that is in Sector No 10, which is a frontrunner. Yet Voronin has been working underground for 11 years.

Of course, not all miners in Vorkuta live in such squalid conditions. Most in fact live in good-quality homes with decent conditions. Funds are needed to construct these homes. Will the strike help improve miners' lives? Absolutely not. The Vorkuta city soviet executive committee has agreed to construct housing in one of the southern oblasts—it will then be possible to move pensioners there (they will go willingly) and give miners the free apartments. There is also a way out. But funds—considerable funds at that—are needed once again for construction. The "Vorkutaugol" Association's financial potential has greatly diminished in connection with the strike. That is the "chain" reaction.

"We can see only one way out," the miners said, "and that is for a government commission to come here."

"Will the master be coming over"? It is a fact that the miners are in a painful position. But who is not nowadays? Even with the current mechanization at the mines, there are still the same old sledgehammers, axes, and crowbars—the invariable tools of a worker underground. There is no guarantee of his complete safety. Two miners on average pay with their lives for every million tonnes of coal extracted. Approximately 1,500 miners die each year in the country in the mines.

Certainly, miners' demands are understandable in many respects. I would like laws on social justice to be established and supreme moral and ethical principles to be asserted more rapidly for them in society. That arouses sympathy and support. But their way is destructive. Any major disorder in production increases the self-inflicted damage to the economy. Now metallurgical workers, peasants, and railroad workers, who frequently have no better life than the miners, are suffering with the miners. I also told the guys from Area No 10 this.

"So you haven't understood anything we said here," I heard in response.

No, I understood everything perfectly well. Yet it is the strikers who refuse to hear anyone except themselves. Such is the "thrill of the fight."

I think that this intolerance comes from the leaders of the strike at "Vorgashorskaya." You are already familiar with one name—Guridov, chairman of the mine's strike committee and at the same time chairman of its trade union committee.

Ivan Ivanovich is a man conspicuous for his manner and his mustache. He may equally be sweet as pie and then hurl all manner of obscenities at you. He was probably hurling obscenities in March, when inciting the miners from "Severnaya" to strike. That is why he was also fined R30 by the court for petty hooliganism.

Since early October Ivan Ivanovich and Sergey Kozlov, his strike committee deputy, have roused their home pit "Vorgashorskaya" to strike virtually without foul language of any kind. A curious detail was soon cleared up at a session of the mine party committee. Both leaders called for the mine to be shut down on behalf of the collective. But they themselves did not ask the collective's opinion—they replaced it with the opinion of the members of the strike committee, and not even all of them. Thus from the very outset there was no question of the democracy which Guridov and his comrades champion. The party committee then unequivocally condemned as illegal the actions of communists Guridov and Kozlov in disregarding the opinion of the collective and the mine's social organizations.

But what is condemnation to Ivan Ivanovich? He is only more popular as a result. These days Guridov is leading the strike from Moscow itself. Apart from the aforementioned demand, Ivan Ivanovich gave Nikolay Ivanovich another package of ultimatums. I do not doubt that if the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers accepts them, the chairman of the "Vorgashorskaya" strike committee will submit another package the next day.

However, Guridov and Kozlov have assistants elsewhere. I was introduced to one at the "Vorgashorskaya" strike committee. Lev Moiseyevich Volovik arrived from the "Coordinating Council of USSR Socialist Trade Unions." I am sorry to say that I was totally in the dark when I first heard of this organization. What does its representative aim to do? "Understand the situation in Vorkuta"—that was the diplomatically vague answer I was given. But my interlocutor, who considers the strike "indisputably correct," has not budged from "Vorgashorskaya." Has he seen the locomotive teams sitting for days in the Vorkuta depot with nothing to do? Does he know that houses will not be constructed at dozens of railroad stations in the polar regions, where people are still living in hovels solely because railroad workers have lost millions of rubles from their social development fund owing to miners' strikes and no one has compensated them for these losses?

...The wheel at the pithead is covered with hoarfrost. The iron rusting from disuse. Miners say: We will strike until 28 November and then go back to work. If, of course, Ivan Ivanovich permits it.

RSFSR Supreme Court Rejects Strikers' Appeal

PM1611143189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[G. Orlovskiy report: "Decision Remains in Force. Vorkuta Strike Committees' Appeals Examined at RSFSR Supreme Court"; final two paragraphs are A. Kapkov report]

[Text] The case in question really is unusual, and it is unprecedented for our courts. For the first time, representatives of the management and of strike committees are appearing in the role of plaintiffs and respondents, and questions of resolving collective labor disputes are being examined. But many things are now happening for the first time among us—such are the times...

As already reported, the leadership of "Vorkutaugol" and the managements of the "Vorgashorskaya," "Komsomolskaya," and "Ayach-Yaga" Mines applied to the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] Supreme Court for the strikes declared at those mines to be deemed illegal, arguing their case by claiming that those strikes had been declared by strike committees and were being conducted in violation of the requirements of the USSR Law of 9 October 1989 "On the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)." The Komi ASSR Supreme Court deemed the strike at the three said mines illegal.

The strike committees were not satisfied with that decision and sent appeals to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Court; and the civil collegium examined them 14 November. Both in the appeals and in their speeches at the collegium session representatives of the city strike committee and the strike committees at the three mines raised the question of reversing the court decision and dismissing the case, citing the court's unsubstantiated application of the 9 October law when resolving the dispute, its violation of norms, and also the court's lack of jurisdiction over this dispute. It has to be said that the RSFSR Supreme Court gave the floor to all the strike committees' plenipotentiary representatives and discussed all the petitions of the parties and of the attorneys representing their interests. In particular, when substantiating the argument relating to lack of jurisdiction over this conflict, the representatives of certain strike committees said that they "had no complaints against the management, only against the government," and that "the strike was merely resumed 25 October and has not ended, and so the 9 October law cannot apply here." Such a "selective" approach to the assessment of their actions did not meet with the judges' support.

Here is how they formulate their conclusions: "The arguments about the absence of a labor conflict in connection with complaints being made not against the mines' management but against the government are groundless, since the suspension of work at the mines actually affects the mutual obligations of the management and the labor collectives, as the parties to collective contracts, particularly with regard to fulfilling production plans, increasing labor productivity, and other obligations." And here is another counterargument: "The strikes at the said three mines were declared in July 1989, suspended, and resumed 25-26 October this year. In accordance with Article 12, Paragraph 'B' of the law of 9 October 1989, strikes which began or are continued in violation of the requirements of Articles 5, 7, 9, and 11 of this law are deemed illegal."

What does this mean? The law came into force, and since the strikes continued, the parties in the collective labor dispute (prior to the resumption of the strikes) were obliged to set up labor arbitration. If disagreements remain even after this, they must be brought to the collectives' knowledge. Only after this do labor collectives have the right, as laid down by the law, to pass strike decisions (two-thirds of the collective in a secret ballot), giving the management 5 days' notice of the start of the strike and its duration. (I believe the reader understands the importance of this norm, for a strike also affects subcontractors.) The civil collegium considered that failures to fulfill those requirements of the law gave the court of first instance sufficient grounds to deem the strike illegal. The decision of the Komi ASSR Supreme Court was left in force.

No, it was not irreproachable. For example, the RSFSR Supreme Court Civil Collegium considered that there were no data in the case to show that there had been violations of the law in the city strike committee's activity. There had been a number of procedural violations, but the action had essentially been satisfied correctly.

...I have endeavored to speak about the essence of the decision on the appeals. Yes, they were rejected, and of course, this circumstance hardly satisfied the strike committees' representatives. But I would like to remind you of the following. The statutes of the Vorkuta City Strike Committee state, in particular, that one of its aims is to promote movement toward a rule-of-law state and the development of civic and legal awareness. The 9 October law might please or displease. But it was adopted by our Supreme Soviet and came into force. And its first application met with vigorous rejection? A court decision is law too. It is possible to appeal against it and then seek to have it reversed in accordance with the law. But a court decision which has come into legal force has to be executed. If we allow ourselves not to recognize this, what will be the worth of the laws in our country? The strictest law and order is needed more than ever today. For all. For everyone. For society and the state.

A final remark. The court did not discuss the miners' demands themselves, and their resolution is a matter for other organs of state. It merely examined the question of observance of the legal procedure for resolving labor conflicts. This was its task in the highly complex situation which has taken shape in Vorkuta today. The court acted in accordance with the law. And so a "global" assessment of its decision should not be made. It was a specific case, and a new one in terms of its legal sources.

Court practice will probably bring to light some omissions in the 9 October law. It is the task of people's deputies to study court practice attentively. Only it is very undesirable for it to be extensive. The law proposed the chief line: a conciliation procedure for resolving collective labor disputes. And this must prevail—this is the guarantee of prudence, restraint, and wisdom.

Representatives of the strike committees of Vorkuta's striking mines held a news conference for foreign journalists in Moscow's "Sputnik" Hotel yesterday. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the central press. Despite the fact that the RSFSR Supreme Court had deemed illegal the strike at the three mines—"Vorgashorskaya," "Komsomolskaya," and "Ayach-Yaga"—the strike committees' representatives insisted on the legitimacy of their demands and rebuked the press for not covering the Vorkuta events objectively enough.

The news conference was addressed by V. Medvedev, secretary of the sector trade union Central Committee, who emphasized the complexity of the situation that has been created at the Vorkuta mines. He confirmed that the way out of this complex situation can be found only by granting the mines full economic independence.

Deputy Premier Ryabev on Miners' Dispute

*PM1511170189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3*

[Interview with L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent V. Goncharov: "Restraint and Reason Needed"—date and place not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] As already reported in the press, the USSR Government believes that the situation which has developed in the mining industry, above all in the Pechora coal basin, on the eve of winter creates an intolerable situation in the Soviet people's lives and in the work of basic and other sectors of the national economy. An examination of progress in fulfilling the government resolution known as Resolution 608, with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, is planned for 17 November. In that connection, PRAVDA correspondent V. Goncharov met with L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and asked him a number of questions of interest to readers.

[Goncharov] First of all, Lev Dmitriyevich, tell us about the political and economic situation now prevailing in the coal industry, especially in the Pechora basin. Will it help perestroyka?

[Ryabev] This year many labor collectives in the sector are working successfully and increasing coal extraction. At the same time we have been met with open conflicts and mass strikes by miners. The disruptions in the miners' work have caused serious material and moral harm to perestroyka and the economy and disorganized production in a number of places.

The general deterioration in the sector's work is linked with the strikes to a large extent. In July and August alone there was a shortfall of 11 million tonnes of coal. The strikes made the economic position of coal industry enterprises even worse. In July and August they lost R179 million in profit. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the miners regrettably did have grounds for protest.

For a long time the sector was mainly concerned about increasing coal production. Social questions and care for people clearly received insufficient attention. The following figures show that. At present there are over 350,000 families on the sector's housing list. In Vorkuta and Inta, for instance, 26,400 families, or 1 in 7, live in dilapidated buildings.

Another cause of the conflict was that enterprises and mines did not have economic independence. What is needed, however, is not to reduce payments to the "center" but to sharply increase production efficiency on the basis of labor collectives' economic interest. (It is no secret that labor productivity in our mines is seven times lower than that in the United States). It is only on a sound economic base that the social situation can be radically improved.

The miners' demands were deemed just and were reflected in USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 608 dated 3 August 1989.

This is no time for strikes. All efforts must be directed toward implementing the decisions that were made. But on 25 October miners at the "Vorkutaugol" association's "Vorgashorskaya" mine stopped work. In November they were supported by other mines in that region. At present 8 of the 13 enterprises in Vorkuta are not working. The plan shortfall has now reached 354,000 tonnes of coal. But the total damage to the national economy in the sector alone already amounts to more than R6 million. All this is causing disruptions in the national economy.

But to demand the prompt supply of metal for mines and plants in the mine machine building industry while at the same time undermining metal production at the Cherepovets and other metallurgical combines—where is the logic in that?

[Goncharov] It is well known that many of the miners' demands included in government Resolution 608 have already been fulfilled, while others are under examination. What aroused the miners' concern and discontent at that time?

[Ryabev] The government resolution reflected the miners' most important demands. This document addresses the complex and multifaceted socioeconomic and production and economic problems, which go beyond the framework of a single sector and affect virtually all aspects of the activity of mining industry enterprises' labor collectives. In addition, the government has approved extra measures not included in this resolution and requiring decisions from ministries, union republic Councils of Ministers, and local organs. Some 75 ministries, departments, and organizations are involved in implementing those instructions and assignments.

It should be noted that exceptionally great importance was attached to the strict monitoring of the fulfillment of the government decisions from the very outset. Of the total package of instructions in Resolution 608, 171 decisions had been made by 1 November compared to the 144 planned for this period, including 89 relating to the Pechora basin.

What has already been done? Questions of additional payments for workers of coal mining enterprises and in mining construction for working evening and night shifts —20 percent and 40 percent of the respective basic wage or salary rate—have been examined and resolved. Additional payments have also been approved for underground workers for the normative time spent in the mine going from the shaft to the workplace and back. Enhanced regional pay coefficients have been introduced for miners in the Pechora basin: up to 1.5 in Inta city, 1.6 in Vorkuta, and 1.7 in the settlement of Khalmer-Yu. As a result, average pay for face work at the "Vorgashorskaya" mine, for example, has increased by R110 a month compared with the first half year to R1,220.

The USSR Council of Ministers has examined and presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet a USSR draft Law on Citizens' Pension Provision. It envisages fundamental changes to the country's pension system. When setting the scale of pensions for workers employed in regions of the Far North and in equivalent places, those pensions are to be based on pay which includes the regional coefficients. The maximum pension may rise from R160 to R400 a month.

Special privileges are envisaged for miners working underground—retirement on pension after 25 years work irrespective of age—and for a number of other trades at the age of 45 after 20 years work.

On 10 November the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet a draft law on vacation. It paid paramount attention to improving the vacation system for workers employed in underground work in hazardous, difficult, and other unfavorable conditions. Maximum leave for them will rise from 39 days to 57 days. A number of other important decisions have been adopted.

However, people's concern is understandable. Resolution 608 reflects the main questions connected with miners' work and daily lives. One can understand the desire to accelerate their implementation. But not through strikes! They can be implemented only in conditions of the normal operation of the national economy and high labor activity by the miners' collectives themselves. This applies particularly to the fulfillment of plans and contractual commitments, programs for the construction of social facilities, and the production of mining equipment.

In the past many resolutions were not completely fulfilled. And of course, there is still a certain lack of confidence in them. We still lack efficiency in the provision of prompt and complete information and in telling each member of the collective about progress in the fulfillment of the resolution. There has been insufficient explanatory work. There have been snags in the fulfillment of a number of points in the resolution, particularly on questions of material and technical supply and the work of rail transport. The decisions adopted on certain items do not satisfy some collectives. Clearly some of the problems need further discussion.

As for the specific points raised by miners in Vorkuta recently, the list is constantly changing. Political and other items have been appearing which have nothing to do with Resolution 608. In addition, it should be borne in mind that a number of points in the resolution ordered different departments to examine matters and adopt decisions (that will be discussed later).

As far as I am aware, the following demands have been formulated so far: The status of the workers (strike) committee is to be approved and the committee is to be given special powers; when pay supplements for work in the far north are being set, coal industry workers are to retain their length of service without restrictions when transferring from one enterprise to another; the question of paying young people who have spent 5 or more years in the Far North a local supplement of 80% when commencing employment there from the first day of work; the USSR Supreme Soviet and Government must set specific deadlines for fulfilling the points of Resolution 608 on introducing pension and vacation privileges; people guilty of failing to fulfill individual points of Resolution 608 and of providing labor collectives with unreliable information should be punished; and the rules on the discipline of coal industry workers must be abolished.

What is there to say on these points?

At present the worker retains his length of service record with the agreement of the management and labor collective council of the enterprise to which he is being transferred. Paying young people the northern supplement from the first day of work there would cost over R1 billion. It is not clear where this money would come from. Under Resolution 608, the government has assumed a commitment regarding the deadline for submitting the draft laws on pensions and vacations and their content to the USSR Supreme Soviet. They have been fully met.

The disciplinary rules must be adjusted in line with the more democratic procedures in the new laws adopted recently and that will be done.

As for assessing progress in fulfilling Resolution 608, that will be done at the conference with N.I. Ryzhkov on 17 November. The present disagreements must be settled in a calm, businesslike atmosphere, not in public squares and at rallies.

[Goncharov] One stumbling block in Vorkuta was the status of the strike committees. What can you tell us about that?

[Ryabev] I shall have to look at the documents.

The protocol on the measures agreed between the Vorkuta citywide strike committee, the citywide rally of miners' collectives, and the government commission on 23 July 1989 make no direct mention of the retention of the strike committees. There is only a note that unless the strike committee's demands are met on time, it reserves the right to resume the strike (in other words, its existence was implied).

Resolution 608 says: Where necessary labor collective councils are to be subjected to new elections in the prescribed manner and with the participation of the strike committees' representatives. For that work it was envisaged that in exceptional cases members of those committees would be released from their main job but for no more than 2 weeks and would receive average pay. That has been carried out everywhere. In addition, it was recommended that the relevant trade union councils combine with regional strike committees in the creation of working groups to monitor the work of enterprises and organizations involved in trade, public catering, and other organizations engaged in serving the population.

In brief, Resolution 608 makes no mention of the continuation or liquidation of standing bodies. That is quite deliberate. At that time, work was in progress on the draft Law on the Procedure for Resolving Labor Conflicts and the final touches had to be applied to it.

A number of times I have asked miners the following question: What are the functions of the workers (strike) committees when there is no strike? Their answer: To monitor the fulfillment of Resolution 608. Of course there must be monitoring. Broad, democratic, and strict monitoring by the workers collectives. But a commission was set up for that purpose (on 12 September) at a joint session of the Mineworkers Trade Union Central Committee and representatives of the strike committees numbering 54 people. It is possible that similar monitoring groups may be set up locally, too, in all the country's coal basins.

I shall say openly that on the strike committees at all levels (from mines to oblasts and regions) there are many active people who are sincerely trying to improve things. Of course their experience, knowledge, and energy must be used. But for creative purposes, not destructive ones. And many of them have already been elected to party city committees, soviets, and commissions designed to monitor the agreement. They head labor collective councils and trade union committees at mines and other enterprises.

Therefore, when people say that Resolution 608 is not being implemented because the status of the workers (strike) committee has not been ratified, that is wrong. That point is not in the resolution. Today it is necessary to act according to the Law on the Procedure for Resolving Labor Conflicts.

[Goncharov] The miners' new demands include political ones. Do you not think that they have been introduced into the mining context from outside?

[Ryabev] When we meet with miners we discuss all sorts of topics. They are not just interested in economic questions but in political ones, too. We discuss the party's prestige. The influence of the workers movement on the progress of perestroyka. Abuses at local levels. The trade unions' role in present day conditions. Regional economic accountability and the status of the republics. The relationship between the rights of the central authorities and the local authorities, and so on. That is understandable. And different viewpoints are expressed in this process.

These problems are being discussed in the country and among miners. They should not be avoided; ways should be sought to resolve the questions that crop up. But all this must be done in the framework of democratic norms, not by means of diktat or demands presented as ultimatums. Some people dislike the Law on Labor Collectives. But it has been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. There are proposals to improve it—then submit them first of all through the region's elected deputies. Some people want the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] to receive great economic independence during the transition to regional economic accountability. Some people see a new role for trade unions in present-day conditions. Some are worried by the question of greater press autonomy. Many of these problems are being discussed at the Supreme Soviet. Who is banning the Vorkuta miners from submitting their suggestions in the normal democratic manner?

But there is another factor here. It is precisely at the time of acute social conflict that some leaders of the cooperative movement and the people's fronts are trying to attach themselves to the workers movement and recruit supporters and put forward dubious slogans. But they find no support among the bulk of the miners.

[Goncharov] Could the strikes in Vorkuta have been avoided? After all, we already have in operation the Law on the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes which clearly describes how to resolve a conflict without resorting to extreme measures.

[Ryabev] Yes, it could have been avoided. On 17 October, when the commission of work collective representatives in Moscow was examining progress in the fulfillment of the agreement (there were eight people there from Vorkuta) a telegram signed by the chairman of the Vorkuta City Workers Committee was sent to the leadership of the country and the regional strike committees of the coal basins containing what was effectively a call to confrontation.

The discussion of the progress in implementing the agreement lasted a whole day with around 100 people present—miners, representatives of ministries and departments, and the press. On 18 and 19 October Comrade Shchadov, the coal industry minister, and I received everyone who wanted to see us to discuss the unresolved problems in this or that region. But unfortunately the representatives of Vorkuta did not take part in the further meetings and conversations.

I do not rule out the possibility that some questions were not clearly explained when reports were made subsequently at local level. But there is no reason to call a strike just because a question is unclear. A strike is not a game, it is a serious step.

[Goncharov] How did events develop at local level?

[Ryabev] On 19 October the Vorkuta strike committees conference passed a decision to strike on 25 October. It began at the "Vorgashorskaya" mine. But the demands were not presented until 2 November. Under the law on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes, however, they should have been formulated and approved at the general meeting no later than 3 days before the strike began. And the decision to stop work should also have been adopted at the general meeting, as long as at least two-thirds of the participants vote for it, and not at rallies.

Incidentally, the statutes of the Vorkuta City Workers (strike) Committee ratified by the City Soviet Executive Committee on 28 July state that it sets itself the task of averting labor conflicts, assisting perestroyka, democratic transformations, the movement toward the law-governed state, the development of a civic and legal consciousness, and real protection for the legitimate rights and interests of working people, and performing its activity within the framework of the USSR Constitution. If the legitimate rights of the Vorkuta labor collectives are infringed, the committee is entitled to announce a prestrike situation and give the management 10 days to eliminate the violations that have occurred. After 20 days it is entitled to raise the question of beginning a strike. But that is an exceptional measure.

I recall that this was written into the statutes by the workers committee itself on 28 July, and this method of resolving a conflict is in keeping with the spirit of the law adopted later. But the city workers committee itself has also breached the law on labor conflicts and its own statutes.

On 26-27 October the Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet examined the management's complaint against a number of mine collectives and declared the strike unlawful. In the near future this question will be examined by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Court.

[Goncharov] How has the situation in the Pechora basin affected the work of other sectors of the national economy? Will this strike not have the effect of lowering the temperature in our apartments when the frosty weather comes?

[Ryabev] Coal from Vorkuta is used mainly to meet the needs of the ferrous metal industry. It is that industry which was first to suffer. In the first 9 days of November the supply of coking coal to the Cherepovets and Lipetsk metallurgical plants was 285,000 tonnes below target. Coal stocks at the Cherepovets combine are sufficient for a few days. To avert the need to halt the coke-oven batteries the metal workers have switched the coke production unit to "slow working" and have warned all their customers of the possible consequences. Trainloads of coking coal are now arriving from the east of the country, even from South Yakutia. But these shipments will cost the state a pretty penny, of course.

As for heating our apartments, the first to suffer could be the residents of Vorkuta itself and the Komi ASSR.

The continuation of the strike also threatens to disrupt a number of social programs and cause problems in the preparations for winter.

[Goncharov] One last question: Representatives of labor collectives from the coal basins will also be taking part in the examination of progress in the fulfillment of Resolution 608 with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Who will decide which people will attend and how many there will be and how will this be done?

[Ryabev] Leaders of ministries, departments, union republics, oblast soviets, and representatives of trade unions responsible for Resolution 608's implementation are being invited to the conference. There will also be representatives of mine labor collectives. The number of participants has been fixed but the collectives themselves will decide who will actually attend.

Vorkuta Coal Strike Background Report

904E0023A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 89 p 2

[First of two installments of the article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent Ye. Losoto: "Vorkuta—Coal"]

[Text] The first warning was sounded in March of this year. The Severnaya mine in Vorkuta went on strike.

The strikers sent telegrams to the party, trade union, and administrative organs. There was no response. Two days later, 104 strikers went on a hunger strike and refused to leave the coal face. They sang the International.

The leadership came running. They called to the surface the secretary of the party organization Nikolay Kislyakov and gave him a bookkeeping document on the payment of bonuses for signature. The sum of bonuses was not filled it—he could write in any sum provided that the poster announcing the hunger strike was taken down.

Kislyakov refused to sign the document saying that they needed the money which they had earned but which had not been paid in full rather than bonuses. He went away to continue the hunger strike.

A deputy minister came down to the mine. He did not find a common language with the miners. At night, the minister and the first secretary of the Komi Oblast Committee of the CPSU flew in. They acknowledged the demands of miners to be fair and thus put an end to the strike and the hunger strike. Local authorities were proclaimed to be at fault.

Subsequent strikes would develop in keeping with this very scenario: Work stoppage—arrival of ranking representatives by air—acknowledgment of all demands as fair—making the local authorities a scapegoat.

In the Vorkuta City Committee of the party, they showed me a place of interest: the just installed window glass. Someone shot at the windows. They apprehended the shooter. He says that he hit the city committee by chance...

Second Secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] City Committee I. Prikhodko became the target of terrorism on the part of a granny who smashed the windows with yogurt bottles: At one point, she had an appointment there concerning the housing issue.

There are iron bars on the windows of the Komsomol City Committee: A bank used to be located there. Employees of the city committee say: "We may have use for them." We may treat this somewhat lightly. However, one thing needs to be kept in mind: The attitude toward the authorities is hardening increasingly, and shifting all the blame to the difficult life of miners and the local authorities is both dangerous and unfair.

Vorkuta is a special kind of city. It grew out of a [prison camp] zone. It has no other history. First, there was nothing there, then there was the zone, and later Vorkuta. There are many hereditary residents of Vorkuta here... An historic tradition—a division into those who produce and those who guard—is felt even now. The workers apply this pattern whether warranted or not, whether called for or not. This pattern was unwittingly reinforced when all the blame was shifted to the local authorities.

Vorkuta is peculiar. As many people perceive it, a barrier between us and them still exists here.

A question to the journalist:

"Are you married to a manager by any chance?"

My answer in the negative is received with satisfaction. This means that I am one of theirs, a working person.

I am not trying to whitewash the local authorities. They are also to blame, with the emphasis on the word "also."

The very Severnaya mine where the hunger strikers sang the International was the first to convert to the second pattern of economic accountability the sense of which is not intricate: You eat as well as you toil. It was also the first one in the Soviet Union to go on strike. What can a mine "eat" under economic accountability if coal production in our country is unprofitable? If the self-cost of 1 ton mined is 48 rubles and the sales price is 12 rubles? The failure to fully pay to the miners the money honestly earned became the cause of the strike. The management had been warned: "Section 9 is like a cauldron boiling over, pay in full, don't bait us." On 18 February, the council of the labor collective of the mine sorted out the case of underpayment. They figured it out: There was nothing to pay with. The deputy director for economics worded it without caution:

"Nobody needs your coal because there is nothing to pay for it with."

One of the members of the Bureau of the City Committee of the party put it to me that way:

"The Severnaya mine was the first to switch to economic accountability and it fell flat on its face. The strikes occurred because of economic accountability."

Another conversation.

"There is no price, there is no market—what kind of economic accountability could there be?"

This is V.S. Golikov, one of the managers of the Vorkutaugol Association.

The question goes to the ministries: What is to be done so that the workers and the managers, who live in the same environment which is not very well suited for life, and who should be involved in a common endeavor which requires mutual trust, would not be set against each other?

That same Golikov has climbed up from the position of drifter helper in the mine. His sick hands, an occupational disease, are the consequence of working in the mine longer than possible.

Also, the first secretary of the city committee of the party, whose fault in the eyes of the people consists of moving into a larger apartment without an increase in the size of his family, has no special food allocation, second home, or cooperative lot in a southern locality (all leading functionaries to a man are suspected of having them). His son failed his admission exams at a college and is now working at a mine—one above the Arctic Circle rather than abroad.

When we were in Golikov's office, a weekly teleconference which the ministry holds was in progress. The minister who had a cold informed his entire coal empire about the fulfillment of resolution No 608 (that is, the government resolution on meeting the demands of miners):

"Yesterday, a meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers on retirement benefits was held. The demands of miners were taken into account and received support. The draft law states to the letter the same thing as resolution No 608. Retirement benefits will be granted in the amount of 70 percent of the salary. Fifteen percent of hard-currency proceeds from exports will be transferred to enterprises."

He dropped the bomb toward the end. "Beginning on Monday, suspend pay for strike committees." Supposedly, there is nothing more for them to do, everything has become all right anyway.

On that same day, the workers told me: "Well, we will stop financing the center beginning on Monday."

So, what did the miners go on strike over? At first sight, in March—over the underpayment caused by economic accountability draining the coffers of the mine (indeed, mines have come to the point of not being able to invite a lecturer for lack of money). What about July? Definitely, in sympathy—it was sympathy for the striking Kuzbass. However, all of this appears so at first sight. Actually, the people went on strike over the deterioration in the already unbearable living conditions, the lack of prospects, over the sacrifice of their health and energy not being compensated for either morally or financially, over actual labor being paid for in increasingly token money which does not even buy them housing...

However, one picture is worth a thousand words. I will tell you what I saw in the mine. First, they took me to the ladies' locker room, and the woman who is in charge of underwear there gave me a full set of mining clothes which looks so beautiful on the screen and in pictures. However, as you will see soon, life is not the same as movies. White drawers and the same kind of blouse made of bed-linen fabric, a quite thin vest over it, pants, and a jacket (in terms of warmth, this is like regular indoor clothing for the house). They gave me a towel to wrap around my neck so that, being unaccustomed to this, I would not catch a cold (there are drafts in the mine). Later, the woman taught me how to wrap on the foot-cloths. There were two of them, large enough for me, but too short for the feet of a male (savings!). They found smaller-size boots for me, and I was outfitted.

At the exit, chairman of the city strike committee Vladimir Grigoryevich Gobrusev was already waiting for me. He works here, in this very Yun-Yaga mine, as a breakage miner. We fitted the helmet, the headlamp, and went to the elevator (it is called the "cage"). We went down and got into a "coach" (beat-up mine truck) together with a shift of miners. I have not been able to find out whether the word "coach" originated with the Decembrists—after all, they were exiled to work in the mines. At any rate, this occurred to me. A peasant would say a "cart," whereas here they call it a "coach."

We went through a dark underground corridor.

A miner who sat nearby reached for a "little break" (mine-issued dry rations for 6 hours of work underground) and produced it for me as the proof of the kind of food they are served. I took out my notebook and began writing things down. Here are the notes I took as the "coach" rolled in the light of the miner's headlamp:

" 'The little break' consists of bread, a slice of cheese, and a slice of sausage which they refer to as 'a dog's delight.'"

This mine is the dampest in Vorkuta. There are mines for show, and there are horrible mines. This one is in between, but very damp.

Behind me was a miner with graceful size 39 feet wearing size 43 boots. He could not get anything smaller. They advised me to walk through the water if my boots did not have holes rather than over the ties because they were covered with slippery oil. Can one really walk around here in boots with holes? The water is ankle-deep everywhere.

Here is what Gennadiy Ivanovich Kutovoy said, verbatim, word for word: "I have to risk my life every day in order to fulfill the plan." Those doing piecework are paid two-thirds of the salary if the plan is not fulfilled. The norms are for hard labor.

We came to a drift face where Gennadiy Ivanovich Kutovoy works as a drifting machine operator. How much time time did we spend there? Perhaps, about 20 minutes. Long enough for my hands and feet to get cold. I do not claim to have the physical strength of miners but my feet in rubber boots do get cold just as fast as theirs. These boots are good for gathering mushrooms in the forest in summer rather than walking through cold water in the mine. This was in the fall, and what about winter?

A special pipe (a ventilation hose) blows air from behind right down Kutovoy's neck. There are drafts, darkness, and one huge slippery puddle under your feet, and when the drifting combine works and metal brackets ("Stalin's hands") move the stope is filled with coal dust. Many people have occupational diseases. Our miners work until they are 50 (this is their retirement age) whereas in other countries there is a certain tenure (for example, 15 years, and they even say that 10) after which a miner stops working because this length of time is considered to be the limit for the human organism. However, during this period the miner provides for a lifetime of support for himself and his family. Our miners whose tenure is over 20 years say that they are now working into their grave.

After the strike, they got a government telegram: "Be advised that the USSR Minzdrav [Ministry of Health] has prepared, in compliance with the USSR Council of Ministers resolution No 608 dated 3 August 1989, a list of occupational diseases which includes varicose veins, silicosis, vibratory disease, cochlear neuritis, bursitis, cervical and lumbo-sacral radiculopathy, and compressive neuropathy, as well as acute forms of hyperthermia: heat stroke and convulsions. Other diseases require additional research. Decisions concerning them will be made in 1989 and 1990. M. Shchadov."

One may very well come to the conclusion that before the strike the miners had no such occupational diseases. Do they exist in our country at all?

Sometimes, an outside observer notices what an eye accustomed to things does not. I am convinced that different clothing is a vital necessity for the miners. If a ventilation hose blows air down your neck from behind you need special overalls which protect your neck reliably. A kind of footwear different in principle is needed. Special gloves are needed instead of the ugly mittens. Let the trade union take it from here; it is my business to prompt them to think. It is clear, however, that with clothing like this one is not a position to work into anything else but his grave.

Now let us discuss why miners risk their lives every day. According to occupational safety rules, they can advance by just 1 meter, and no more. They should stop and reinforce the walls and the ceiling ("the worked-out space") by concrete brackets. Incidentally, everything is done manually. However, there is no time to do this: For example, trucks are available now, and later, as is the custom here, they may not be. This means that they advance without reinforcing it. So, it is either occupational safety or the plan and remuneration.

They are not as mindless as it might seem. A professional is at work rather than on an excursion in the mine. He sees the way the overburden is taking it, and what the "degree of falling" is, and depending on this allows himself a particular degree of risk. Still, this amounts to endangering one's life. You do it by "eyeballing" things, following your hunches, but you do get buried underneath.

It is hard when there is spring in Russia. They show spring on TV, and cherry blossoms too. One resident of Vorkuta told me that he has not seen cherry blossoms in all his life except on TV.

When a miner goes down to the mine in the course of the polar night it is still dark. When he goes up it is already dark. He fails to see for months at a time not only the sun—it is not visible during the polar night—but even light, "as a mole," as they say here.

Kutovoy's team was assigned to work not far from another team in such a manner that they had to share the same track. This means that disruptions in the supply of trucks are sort of built in. I could not help it and asked: "Did they do it on purpose or what?"

They answered: "No, it was hardly done on purpose. This is just how our engineers think."

Subsequently, we went along a corridor (a "drift") and came to a chamber where another team was at work. Vladimir Grigoryevich Gobrusev, the main striker, wanted to show me the entire mine as it is. He said that at this point we had to go into a section, any section, there are 80 of them in the chamber. He had brought new knee protectors for me. I sat down on the floor, shone my miner's headlamp into a narrow opening, and understood that I cannot go in there on all fours but will have to low-crawl in there, and could not bring myself to do it. Vladimir Grigoryevich was offended.

Later, I tried to make up for my transgression in every way. Finally, he forgave me and told me about himself:

"This is where my work station is. I get into the section, and over there I repair roof-bars, hoses, and hydraulic locks. Mine is the repair shift. You get up at 04.00 hours, at 06.00 hours you change. Three shifts mine, and one shift repairs. The mine operates around the clock. This is how I have worked from 1968 until 20 July 1989 when the collective nominated me to the strike committee."

Later he defined 20 years of his life as follows:

"Staying in the opening on metal and damp ground. The system is so calculated that I will not make it out of there alive."

Is he right as far as the "system" is concerned? Yes, he is right. I am not saying that the system was deliberately designed to be that way, I don't, but you already know what the origins of Vorkuta were, and the traces of it are still perceptible. It is no accident that one of the demands of miners called for eliminating "St. George's Day" [the day once a year when serfs could go to another master] Before the strike, it was impossible to go to another mine without the consent of the management; the miner would lose his northern bonus, and would have to begin qualifying for it from point zero, as a person arriving here for the first time. Only once in 5 years, when one contract expired and the other was not signed yet, people could switch to another place without losing the northern bonus—hence the "St. George's Day." This point is justly called "serfdom." In resolution No 608, it is mentioned specifically. It is exactly one of the points which can be carried out realistically.

Which other points of the "system" are set up in such a manner as to make it impossible for the person to get out of the underground? We have already mentioned the exceedingly long tenure (up to 50 years); it exceeds all biological potential. What else? There is no opportunity to go anywhere from Vorkuta, there is no opportunity to buy a cooperative apartment in central Russia; all places have waiting lists of their own. However, all of this is not by design. These are the signs of our poverty, of the lack of goods to be bought with rubles, technological backwardness... and also of the absence of the workers' movement. Now we have such a movement. It has stated its demands and claimed its rights. However, as I see it, it has not yet come to comprehend that all of us are bound by the confines of general poverty, backwardness, and economic and financial ruin—and this includes the infamous bureaucrats.

At present, the workers' movement is like a bull in a china shop. One clumsy move, and everything will be broken to pieces.

After I failed to bring myself to crawl into the section, Vladimir Grigoryevich crawled away alone with my knee protectors, and I went together with a team leader down the drift to meet him at the appointed location where he was to crawl out. Indeed, when you are new to it, the mine with its narrow spaces, darkness, and moisture is oppressive.

Finally, I found out how to step so that I would not slip or rock. Walking in the mine also takes some getting used to.

Finally, there was the cage, that is, the elevator upstairs. We did no work but we were soiled with coal dust. The thing that is excellent at this Yun-Yaga is the hot shower. They give you a wisp and soap which is now abundant here.

Have a good bath!

Catholics Demonstrate in Ivano-Frankovsk

LD2711213489 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] About 3,000 people demonstrated in Ivano-Frankovsk on Sunday to press for the legislation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The demonstrators marched 2 kilometers from a small church in a residential area to a large cathedral in the center of the city, and then conducted an hour-long service. The march was peaceful and there were no incidents.

The chairman of the municipal council of Ivano-Frankovsk, regional center of western Ukraine, (Bogdan Yakovichin), told Radio Moscow that the prolonged conflict over the rights of a legal existence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church interfered with normal life and was fraught with emergencies.

Moldavia Changes Constitution, Election Laws

PM2711152389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[ATEM-TASS report: "Work of the Session"]

[Text] Kishinev, 23 Nov—The session of the republic's Supreme Soviet which is being held here has adopted laws on amendments and additions to the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution and the elections of Moldavian SSR and local soviet people's deputies.

The powers of the Supreme Soviet are being expanded: It is being given the right to appeal to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, or the Constitutional Oversight Committee if in its opinion a legislative or other act of the USSR infringes the sovereign rights of the Moldavian SSR. It is also entitled to suspend the operation of USSR Council of Ministers acts on the republic's territory if they do not conform to the Moldavian SSR Constitution and laws and at the same time to raise with the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of repealing or amending those acts.

The law thus adopted imposes on the Supreme Soviet the task of ensuring and safeguarding the rights of the ethnic groups living on Moldavia's territory.

One of the fundamental innovations in the law "On Elections of Moldavian SSR People's Deputies" is the establishment of a numerical qualification for a collective to be entitled to nominate a candidate people's deputy—it must have at least 100 workers. Collectives with fewer workers may join together in a given electoral okrug to hold a joint meeting to nominate candidate deputies. The session adopted a decision to hold the elections 25 February 1990.

Changes in Belorussia Supreme Soviet Elections

LD1411115189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 on 14 November broadcasts a live report from Minsk on the decisions of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on the structure of bodies of power and elections. Reporter Petr Vakreyskiy notes that in accordance with changes to the republican constitution, a Supreme Soviet of 360 deputies will be directly elected. Of these, 310 will elected by constituencies that will have approximately equal numbers of voters taking into account the territorial divisions. There was a lot of discussion about public organizations and they will have a quota of direct representation, the reporter says. But not all organizations are included. Thus of the quota of 50, 29 seats have been allocated to veterans of war and labor, and the remaining 21 to invalids, deaf and blind organizations. Nearly one third of the population of Belorussia come into the category of least well off: 2.3 million people.

The deputies voted against pre-election constituency meetings, and in favor of enabling any number of candidates to be put on the voting list, Vakreyskiy says. Deputy Anatoliy Semenovich Sharonoyetsev expressed satisfaction at the democratic steps taken, and at the attitude of labor collectives, he adds.

Vakreyskiy then describes the new measures regarding local elections. The number of deputies is to be cut, with the aim of creating more mobile and capable bodies. Thus Minsk used to have 500 deputies in the town soviet; now it will have half as many. In the republic as a whole there is a total of 85,000 deputies in local soviets; now about 56,000 are to be elected.

He says that the upcoming session of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia at the beginning of December will decide on the date of the elections.

Minsk Meeting Commemorates 1939 'Reunification'

PM1511110989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[BELTA-TASS report: "Reunification Jubilee"]

[Text] Minsk, 11 Nov—The participants in today's ceremonial session of representatives of the public in Soviet Belorussia called 12 November 1939 an act of historical justice. It was on that day that an extraordinary session of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet adopted the law on the reunification of Western Belorussia with the Belorussian SSR within the Soviet Union.

In the report on the 50th anniversary of this historic event, N.I. Dementey, chairman of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium, stressed that reunification marked the end of the unnatural state whereby the Belorussian nation was divided as a result of the imposition on the young Soviet republic of the crippling Peace Treaty of Riga with bourgeois Poland in March 1921.

The threat of Hitlerite enslavement which hung over the Western Belorussian lands after the defeat of Poland in September 1939 objectively accelerated the Soviet government's decision to protect the population of those regions.

The Western Belorussian oblasts, which prior to reunification were in the position of semicolonial backwaters, are now Belorussia's major industrial centers. The region's social and cultural appearance has also changed fundamentally. Belorussian is now the language of instruction in 1,151 schools and for the training of specialists in 1 university, 5 institutes, and dozens of technical schools and colleges. Great attention is being paid to reviving the cultural traditions of the ethnic minorities living on these territories.

New Conclusions Drawn on Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

LD1311130589 Vilnius in Lithuanian
to North America 0100 GMT 10 Nov 89

[Text] Audrius Matonis reporting. As we have already reported, on 11 November a sitting was held in Moscow of the parliamentary commission set up to give political and legal assessment of the USSR and Nazi German Nonaggression Treaty of 1939.

Professor Vytautas Landsbergis, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the Sajudis Seimas Council and member of this parliamentary commission, in his interview to the newspaper TIESA explained that Aleksandr Yakovlev, chairman of the commission, summoned the parliamentary commission after an interval of 3 ½ months. This interval cannot be explained, if not perhaps by the fact that there had been parties concerned that the commission would not complete its work.

However, the commission is to present its conclusions to the 2d Congress of the People's Deputies; the congress is inevitably coming nearer, therefore, the commission was summoned for a sitting.

As is known, the commission drew its primary conclusions in the summer of the current year—it was signed by 21 of the 26 members of the commission. The conclusions were not signed by A. Yakovlev, chairman of the commission, although he personally did not object to their content. An oral agreement was reached that the conclusions would be made public, unfortunately, this was done until today. Members of the commission, the USSR peoples' deputies, had signed a telegram to M. Gorbachev asking him to urgently use his authority so that the conclusions could be made public before 23 August, the 50th anniversary of Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. There was no reply to this telegram.

The deputies then appealed to the Moscow Central Television for permission to make a statement. The management of Moscow Television refused to have then on their program. Therefore, on 29 September, deputies of the commission held a press conference in Moscow to explain that it was not their fault that the work of the commission had not been finished. This is the story of the protracted activities of this commission.

Strange as it may seem, when the commission gathered on 11 November there was no dicussion about what should be done with the conclusions which had already been drawn and agreed upon; how these conclusions should be enhanced and presented to the congress. Instead, a completely new draft was presented. Vytautas Landsbergis said that they did not manage to find out who the author of this new draft was. At the beginning Aleksandr Yakovlev jokingly attempted to assume he was the author, however, when the draft was referred to as A. Yakovlev's draft, he did not like it.

In a nutshell, the new draft is anonymous. The new draft was described by Vytautas Landsbergis as controversial, conservative, and even we can say, reactionary. In some places attempts are made to justify Stalin's policy. A retreat is made to even greater indetermination while proposing to reproach the secret protocols only in the sense that these did not comply with the Leninist policy, of the foreign policy characteristic of socialism. Therefore, the commission found that the draft was undebatable.

Vytautas Landsbergis spoke at the sitting of the commission; during the interview to the newspaper TIESA he presented the main points of his commission report. According to him the final conclusions of the commission would be the following.

The Soviet Union continues to remain without universally recognized laws criteria on her relations with other states—neither does the Soviet Union plan to adopt such criteria.

The draft is directed at the domestic consumer only, because it is clearly detrimental to the international prestige of the USSR. Besides, it seems that the aim of this draft was to raise insurmountable contradictions and to draw a conclusion that the commission was incapable of having a common point of view, or was perhaps giving up its functions, or something like this. This is the impression it could make.

Vytautas Landsbergis and others proposed to carry on with the text which was agreed upon in the summer, and on the basis of this to prepare a document for the congress. Estonian deputies presented an even shorter edition and it seems there were no principled contradictions against it. The essence of this text would be the following: the secret protocols did exist, the copies of the protocols are reliable, the content of the secret protocols run counter to the norms of the international legal laws and, therefore, these are null and void since the time of their signing.

Vytautas Landsbergis informed that conclusions of this kind should be prepared, however, considerably broader information should be given to the congress—this was agreed upon after 2 hours of discussion at the sitting. Aleksandr Yakovlev, chairman of the commission, will give the information to the congress.

Vytautas Landsbergis was asked if it was not possible that the new draft of conclusions would be presented to the congress despite all this. He answered that such conclusions would not be signed by the Baltic deputies, nor by the democratically inclined Moscow deputies and the Moldavian deputies. The fact is, that the fate of neither Moldavia, along with the Baltic countries and Poland, was mentioned in the secret protocols all the time. Vytautas Landsbergis thinks that there is a clear tendency in the new draft conclusions to orientate everything into the Baltic problem, at the same time putting pressure on the Baltic republics—the trouble makers."

Estonian Komsomol May Be Dissolved 1 Mar

LD2711131689 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] A short while ago, we telephoned the Political Enlightenment Building where the 21st Congress of Estonian Komsomol is continuing. Ain Saarna reported as follows.

[Saarna] This morning, the 21st Congress of the Estonian Komsomol continued work. After last night's Komsomol [VLKSM] secession, today the question of the existence of Estonian Komsomol was discussed. Nearly 20 delegates took the floor and they overwhelmingly supported discontinuing the work of the organization. Much time was taken by resolving editorial problems and debates, but in the afternoon, two draft resolutions were handed out to the delegates. The first of those considered the activity of the Estonian Komsomol to be discontinued as of today; the second draft announced a transition until 25 March of next year. With a majority of votes, the congress decided to take the second draft as the basis of discussion, and thus not stop activity instantly. There were long debates about whether the words "transition period" should be replaced with the words "liquidation period." One can say that occasionally, the debate became quite absurd.

By now the stance has been adopted to the effect that the 21st Congress has resolved to announce that the Estonian Komsomol is in a transitional period up until 1 March 1990. From that date, the activity of Estonian Komsomol is then to be considered as having come to a stop.

At present, this is far from definitive. Something may still be redecided. That has been demonstrated by the progress of the 21st Congress. One thing is now certain: The 21st Congress of Estonian Komsomol will go down in history as an exceptionally inept and indecisive congress, a congress that took place, so to speak, under the label of the circus. What will happen next? That is very difficult to say at present.

Attitudes of Latvians to Russians Deplored

PM2711141889 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Galina Tkachenko article: "Why I Left the Baltic Region. Confession En Route"]

[Text] Novosibirsk—I came to Riga for the first time in 1960 with a group of students from the Taganrog Radio Engineering Institute. We had been sent for training to the VEF Association. I did not think, I did not guess that 4 years later I would come once again to Latvia—but for a long time, with my 1-year-old daughter and my lieutenant husband.

So we became "occupiers." In the very first days of my life in Latvia I became familiar with the inscription on the wall of my home proclaiming this fact, and also with the requests to leave the mansion. They were washed off, they reappeared in one form or another. In the end, I began to react to them as to any "graffiti" creation.

I do not presume to judge whether the subunit in which my husband served was needed. The conversation was short: You are needed—you have been drafted—serve. Could I think of myself as an "occupier" if I did not come here of my own volition and I did not intend to do any harm to the local population? Incidentally, this comprised not only Latvians, but also Russians, Jews, Germans, Belorussians, and Ukrainians.

Nonetheless, on their days off the men tried not to go out in their military uniforms after service to avoid running into, if not a "compliment", then an alienated "nesaprot"—"I don't understand." I got a job in line with my engineering education. At work, evidently, I made some progress, because soon I was invited to another plant at a higher post, and then to a third. Three worker collectives make it possible to draw some conclusions.

The first and main one: In labor collectives, conflicts arise least of all because of nationality. There, people are united by a common cause, and skill, character, performance, initiative, and intelligence are valued. But nationality is given to a person at birth, like height and external appearance. Where is the personal merit if one person is born a Russian and someone else is born a Latvian?

In my last years there I used to travel to Riga to work. An hour there and an hour back on the suburban electric train every day. And the more I understood the Latvian language, the more difficult it became for me to live there. I fell prey to commonplace nationalism. At the plant there was one attitude, in the street there was another.

If you brush against someone unintentionally, as happens in a street crush, and you apologize in Russian, this is sometimes followed by: "Krievijas cukas." So politely, and with a smile. Generally speaking, Latvians are polite people; no match for many Russians, I must admit. But I started to understand the language and, within the limits of everyday contact, to use my knowledge automatically. And I understood that they were saying politely: "Russian pigs." The words "Russian pigs, go home" were scratched once again in the entrance after repairs. And those who despoil the walls? What should they be called? The story of the flags began on holidays: People started to take them down during the night, or else the Soviet flags could be torn to pieces, and sometimes this did happen. But people "did not notice" this and did not talk about it, and the press kept silent.

What specifically pushed me to decide to leave?

I had to meet with a certain specialist. A reputable scientist, a candidate of sciences; for more than 2 hours he tried to convince me that the Russians had spoiled everything, including the Latvians, that they don't have a home or roots, that there was a lack of culture everywhere because of them.... These hours of verbal psychological dueling cost me dearly.

When I got into the train, I could hardly speak. Then a woman got into the car and asked where she should get out for the memorial where the fascist concentration camp had been? There was silence. Only one woman answered in the one line she knew: "We don't understand Russian." I just managed to utter: "At the next stop!" And I realized that this was the sign. I had to leave.

Now I read letters from acquaintances and friends, many of whom have remained there and for whom it is not so easy to tear themselves away, since they have spent their whole life there and their children have already married and their grandchildren are growing up there. Is it necessary to tear up these roots? Isn't the propaganda being conducted by the Latvian People's Front newspaper ATMODA like a call for deportation? Taking their cue from this "democratic" press, other extremists are also shouting, including those from our own so-called independent SIBIA [SIBERIAN NEWS AGENCY], which publishes its vociferous "works" somewhere in the Baltic region. Completely ignorant of the local situation, they assert that the Russians should be evicted from there and that Interfront is virtually the main stronghold of nationalism. What rubbish! And it has only one aim: To increase discomfort in people's minds, to set people against each other, and then to surface on the crest of artificially created dirty scum.

The extremists in Latvia are fighting for immediate secession. I am sure that, in the event of a referendum, they would be in the minority because not only would the Russian-speaking population be against it, but also a considerable section of the Latvian working people. Among the extremists there are most likely idlers, failed creative and scientific workers, former managers and those who simply love any glory and intense feelings. They vent their dissatisfaction on a mythical enemy—on people who are not of the "right" nationality.

I happened to talk with many people in Latvia quite often and in a confidential, domestic situation. Oh, by no means everyone lived well under Ulmanis.... My friend Velta also recalled the hard work in somebody else's fields, and the single pair of boots given to the whole family out of the boss' generosity, and the pigs which the children tended. And how many resources had to be allocated for postwar restoration! Sometimes even the blasphemous thought came to mind: New towns have been constructed in places where the war had been. At whose expense? At the expense of those barracks which appeared in Siberia along with the evacuated enterprises. At the expense of those people who lived and still live in them. At the cost of a declining culture for which nothing at all has remained.

Isn't it better, then, for us to rectify the situation in the country together than to deepen the dissension no one needs?

Latvian Independence Anniversary Celebrated

PM2311122789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report: "Celebration in Riga"]

[Text] Latvian Republic Day, which has been declared a holiday by a Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet resolution, was celebrated 18 November in Latvia for the first time in postwar history.

Hundreds of thousands of people from all the republic's rayons and all its corners near and far gathered on that day on the Daugava embankment.

"Past events are connected with the course of time and with the mutual dependence of peoples' lives," A. Gorbunov, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted the day before in his address to the Latvian peoples. "For example, if there had been no revolutions in Russia and Germany, then Latvia would scarcely have succeeded at that time in getting state independence, which was declared 18 November 1918."

On the Latvian republic anniversary, in addition to Latvians representatives of other peoples, Livonians, Russians, Poles, Jews, Belorussians, Lithuanians, and Estonians who have been living here for a long time, went out onto the Daugava embankment.

As has often happened recently, the celebrations on the occasion of the national holiday did not, unfortunately, manage without extremist slogans and appeals.

It remains to be said that one more event was timed to coincide with this date: In the Central State Archive the "Personal Foundation of K. Ulmanis, president of the Latvian republic," in which 461 items are exhibited, was opened to the general public.

USSR Constitution Burned at Latvian Rally

90UN0286A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 2 Nov 89 p 4

[Article by V. Selyevskiy: "The Constitution Has Been Burned. What Next?"]

[Text] When sharp objections to the members of some informal organizations are attempted or, all the more so, when their sore spots are touched, they most often respond by angry references to the constitution of the country or the republic: We have a right to! There appears to be nothing to object to this. Indeed, the freedom of meetings, rallies, street processions, and demonstrations, and freedom of speech are guaranteed for all. On 28 July 1989, a regular session of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet adopted the republic law "On Meetings, Rallies, Street Processions, and Demonstrations." However, the following was written in it as well in black and white:

"It is inadmissible to organize events which are aimed at changing the fundamentals of the state and social system of the Latvian SSR, the propaganda of war and ethnic hatred, and infringements on the constitutional rights of citizens, or other actions prohibited by law."

If this requirement is not complied with, the meeting or rally, street procession or demonstration, "are discontinued at the request of the authorized representatives of the proper executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies."

The readers will excuse me for this long introduction, but in this instance we cannot do without a legal lead-in. As far as the fairy tale—if only it were a fairy tale!—it developed as follows....

Toward the end of last week, leaflets boldly posted over the advertisements of concerts, plays, and exhibitions appeared on many poster stands in Riga: The so-called Latvian Democratic Union invited all those who so wish to come to the Vermanskiy Park to its meeting. Let us not take the authors to task for returning the old name to the park without authorization; nostalgia seems to be the fashion now. The main point was that the citizens of Riga and the guests of the Latvian capital turned out to be "abreast" of the developments. Besides, these are absolutely legitimate rights: To invite people, to accept an invitation, or fail to do so.

By the beginning of the meeting, several dozen people gathered at the Kirovskiy Park. To be sure, the audience grew gradually to between 200 and 250 people at the expense of the curious, not to use the word idlers. However, they saw and heard nothing new at first. Placards? This homemade graphic art is already known by its dubious sense of humor and tr-r-r-emendous courage, The "democrats" had prepared the side-dish for their event in what they call the best tradition—"Boycott the elections!", "Communists Should Not Teach Me What to Think and Say." Of course, the organizers of the meeting did not forget the KGB. How could they do without the KGB—keeping silent about the state security has become bad form among some informals. This time around, they combined the abbreviation KGB with a swastika (perhaps, they were sick of repeating themselves).

The meeting was conducted by Sergey Koncha, one of the LDS [Latvian Democratic Union] leaders. Showing to the audience his loyalty to the ideals of his organization, he spoke about.... what? We believe that our readers, even those who have never been to the meetings of these "democrats," have already guessed what the speaker said. Yes, he accused the CPSU of every mortal sin. Yes, he called for boycotting the forthcoming elections to the local soviets. Yes, he proposed to give up celebrating the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution (however, he kept silent about whether he personally was going to take advantage of the days which are free due to the holidays or will sweat blood as a sign of protest). In a word, those assembled at the Kirovskiy Park were treated to the already musty set of verbal cliches concerning the mythical crimes of the party, the immediate secession of Latvia from the USSR, and so on, and so forth.

Incidentally, this—freedom of speech—is within the framework of the Constitution. After all, nobody was rounded up forcibly in order to listen to Koncha.

Perhaps, nobody forcibly dragged the guests of the meeting to Riga. In this reference, this question arises: Why did a Vladimir Yanko from Tula, a representative of "the Ukrainian People's Democratic League Yevgeniy Chernyshev," as well as a member of the Moscow group with the high-sounding name "Civil Dignity" and an envoy of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], have to travel so far for a show that cheap? The NKAO envoy proclaimed his solidarity with "the fighting people of Latvia." However, the Constitution once again provides for complete freedom to roam the Soviet Union in order to commune with one's brothers in spirit and once again show the broad public that the vocabulary of the adherents of "the democratic union" does not vary from one region to another.

In all fairness, let us note that some "variety" was nonetheless introduced into the phraseology of the LDS. For example, the "recently subjected to repressions" Modris Luyans, a member of the Union of Latvian Workers, proposed that the status of political prisoners be immediately established in the USSR for...the young people of draft age who refuse to serve in the Soviet Army so as to rid them of the necessity to be imprisoned next to common criminals. "The representative of the Russian nationality in the DNNL [expansion unknown], Valeriy Belyablya, added a comparison of "the Soviet and German occupation" to the standard call for "the promptest possible withdrawal of Soviet occupation troops."

In general, everything proceeded in keeping with the familiar scenario, everything was done on cue. Incidentally, the holding of the LDS meeting was authorized by the Kirovskiy Rayon Executive Committee—they confirmed this for me when I called. In general, this was in compliance with the law protecting constitutional guarantees. Later, these guarantees were...set ablaze quite literally at the meeting in the Kirovskiy Park.

Speeches are fine, but toward the end of any spectacle some spectacular show is in order. Fireworks would have been nice. However, the LDS leaders had not acquired fireworks. Koncha resorted to what was the most accessible. Thinking that disturbing the ashes of the Helsinki-86 member Yuris Ziyemelis, who died recently, is no sin, he quoted the words of the deceased to the effect that "the Constitution did not protect him, as well as many other political prisoners." As it were, those who had departed for the better world could neither confirm nor deny the "quotations." Having paid homage to Ziyemelis, Koncha took a booklet with the text of the Constitution and set fire to it on the band stand in front of the most respectable audience....

Therefore, the practicing "democrat" finished off the text of the Constitution. It is interesting to know what he expects to proceed from in defending his convictions in this event. After all, the rights have been burned....

However, this is not the time for sarcasm. In the very center of Riga, a sanctioned meeting was held which ended in a clear-cut desecration of the Main Law of the country.

I can guarantee that there is no person who would not like to live in a law-governed state, just as you would not name for me a democratic country where anybody would be given an opportunity to witness a public burning of its constitution.

The LDS members burned the USSR Constitution on 30 October 1989.

This is a question addressed to the procuracy of the republic: Is it going to view such tricks with Olympian calm this time as well? The goings-on in the Kirovskiy Park by no means fit the pattern of common hooliganism. This is why an extensive legal lead-in was needed at the beginning of this sad narrative.

Customs Seizes Drugs at Riga Port

LD0511223489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 5 November in its "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a report on a drugs seizure. The correspondent says that "customs officers seized a large quantity of drugs in our country."

The video shows dock scenes, as the correspondent points out Riga maritime port. The correspondent points out a container and says: "This container travelled a long way. It arrived in Nakhodka from the Philippines, then traversed the country before finally arriving in Riga. From there, it was supposed to continue on to Belgium. The addressee is Hendricks Firm, Ramsteeg." The video shows label of same. The correspondent says, "as it turned out, this was a false address. Here you see the contents of the container: sackloads of aquarium sand. The sand was also supposed to have filled the metal drums. But instead of sand, customs officers discovered 185 kg of majijuana in them." "Pay attention to the special cardboard and polythene lining; this is how the drug mafia smugglers tried to safeguard their cargo from sniffer dogs. It didn't work. The value of the contraband poison is around $ 1 million on the black market. Sixteen people involved in the drugs trade have already been arrested in Belgium and the Netherlands in connection with this case."

The correspondent concludes the report with an interview the B.M. Butin, identified by caption as chief of the operation, who says that international experience was drawn on during the operation and that it isn't always easy to know where to look.

Tajik Supreme Soviet Makes Personnel Changes

LD2511114889

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik at 1700 GMT on 24 November carries a report on the 12th session of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet in its 11th convocation.

The report notes that the Supreme Soviet deputies discussed draft laws on amendments and additions to the Tajik SSR Constitution and the Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the Tajik SSR. Deputy Pallayev, Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, presented a report.

The Supreme Soviet approved the law of the Tajik SSR on amendments and additions to the Tajik SSR Constitution. The deputies then discussed the draft Law on Election of People's Deputies of the Tajik SSR.

Relevant resolutions concerning changes in the Presidium of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet and in the republican government were discussed and adopted.

The report informs that the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet session discussed organizational issues. The session relieved Comrade Ivan Fedorovich Dedov from the post of deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in view of his appointment as chairman of the republican commission on the election of the Tajik SSR people's deputies. Comrade Usman Ghaniyevich Usmanov, who was deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, was elected deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The session approved Comrade Atakhan Latifi as deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Commentary on Solzhenitsyn, Other Writers

LD2711214189 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Twenty-seven years ago, in November 1962, this country first found the name of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn with the publication of his short novel "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich", which was soon nominated for the country's highest literary prize. Twenty years ago, in November, 1969, Solzhenitsyn was expelled for the USSR Union of Writers and soon after that received the Nobel Prize for Literature. And in 1974 he was stripped of Soviet citizenship and exiled and has been living abroad ever since. Dmitriy Linnik comments.

[Linnik] Each of Solzhenitsyn's few works that were published in this country produced a controversy. [passage omitted] This whole story brings to mind the recent terrible squabble over the publication of Salman Rushdie's "Satanic Verses". One can respect the author's right to voice his views and one can also respect the right of Muslims not to be insulted. Solzhenitsyn's books were doomed because they were insulting to Soviet fundamentalists whose positions until the age of glasnost were very strong. The parallel is, of course, only superficial, for Rushdie wrote a mere fantasy while Solzhenitsyn spoke the truth.

In this light the publication of the "Gulag Archipelago", his major work on Soviet history, previously hushed up, has been a landmark in glasnost and a sign of Soviet fundamentalism receding. People discovered the book and came upon the inevitable question, how come the greatest living Russian writer is living abroad. Fundamentalism is rolling back, but fundamentalist mentality is still there. A publishing company here has come in for criticism for putting out another edition of crime stories written by a man, Lev Sheinin, who, it turns out, was implicated in some of Stalin's frame-up trials. The publishers said they didn't know, and now they would never publish the book again.

One should make no bones about the fact that Solzhenitsyn is anti-Soviet, but he is an important part of our life and I'm happy we got that far.

Medvedev Addresses Academy of Sciences Meeting

LD2711223389 Moscow TASS in English 2218 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS— Active and creative elaboration of documents which in less than a year's time will be in the centre of attention of the 28th Party Congress is the goal the delegates to the conference of party organisations of the USSR Academy of Sciences have set for themselves.

The conference was held over the weekend in the town of Zvenigorod near Moscow. Around 300 representatives of 180 party organisations of the Academy gathered at the conference at the initiative of primary party organisations.

Addressing the conference, Politburo Member Vadim Medvedev focussed on the need for perestroyka within the party. "The need to restructure the party has really moved to the forefront today," he said. "Today we can and must accelerate perestroyka of the party in a close line with the perestroyka of our entire mechanism of society."

Perestroyka within the party, Medvedev continued, must clearly proceed more actively. The party must set the pace in the renovation, above all in the ideological plane. Referring to the convening of the 28th Party Congress, Medvedev said that moving it closer by half a year is dictated by life which has demonstrated that the 19th Party Conference decisions have to some extent become obsolete, to say nothing about the drafting and changes in the programme and the rules of the CPSU adopted by the previous congress.

The essence of perestroyka in the party, Medvedev said, is to transform it from an organisation above everything and everyone into a political vanguard of society—of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia. In this case the party does not shirk its responsibility, does not relinquish its role of a ruling party, but carries it out strictly in accordance with the law, the principles of a law-governed state and civil society.

Medvedev said that Communists did not refuse to participate in discussions on the party's role in society. "We only object to the discussion and the idea of multipartizanship being used for speculative purposes," he said.

Salayev Reelected Academy of Sciences President

NC0611081189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 3 Nov 89

[Text] A general meeting has been held by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences. At the meeting the organizational question resulting from the expiration the president of the Academy of Sciences' term of office was examined. El'dar Salayev, member of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences and USSR people's deputy, was reelected president of the Academy of Sciences.

Editorial Assesses Economic Reform Conference

PM2711095589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Accelerating the Pace of Reform. Party Committees' Attention Must Focus on Questions of Economic Transformations"]

[Text] The all-union scientific-practical conference on problems of radical economic reform lasted 3 days. Speeches were delivered by around 200 of its 1,400 participants—economists and enterprise and department officials. The starting point used by the country's economists to map out the future paths for the development of economic transformations was the concept of reform formulated by the CPSU Central Committee's June (1987) Plenum.

Time waits for no man. A situation developed during the last 2 years or so when we lost our grip on the economic management levers for a while. This was said with alarm at the conference. The old administrative edict system is no longer working, while the new one—based on democratic methods—is still not functioning at full power. Indecisiveness and incomplete measures were allowed in the course of the reform's implementation. The reform was not being implemented comprehensively, its provisions were being introduced in isolation, without any interlinkage or definite deadlines. It was these conditions that produced the need to bring new management methods more quickly into operation, so as to shorten the period of transition from the one system to the other.

Speaking about the need to resolve this task, M.S. Gorbachev noted in his speech to the all-union students' forum that we have now arrived at a time in the development of the present stage of perestroyka when it is already incumbent on us to raise the question of accelerating it. Now we must clearly define the stages in the acceleration of economic reform. Attention will also focus on these questions at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which will begin its work 12 December 1989.

It must be borne in mind, moreover—and this was repeatedly emphasized at the conference—that our party and the Soviet people have chosen the socialist path of development and will march along it on the basis of their own values, above all social ownership, working people's power, the leading role of the party, and the absence of any individual exploitation. We are in favor of socialism as perceived by Lenin, of socialism with a humane and democratic image. In favor of a society where people really are the object of social development, a society with a high degree of social protection for people; in favor of developing people's creative abilities, talents, and economic acumen.

Analyzing the previous stage of economic reform, participants in the debate noted that associations and enterprises and collective and state farms have still not really acquired the proclaimed rights, autonomy, and self-management. Conditions for transition to full economic accountability have still not been created. Nor was public awareness prepared for sharp changes in economic life. The commitment to dependence and leveling is still a tenacious phenomenon. Only the development of diverse forms of ownership can guarantee the increasingly full implementation of our society's fundamental principle: from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor.

The deepening of reform is impossible without the creation of a socialist market. Only the switch to a market in commodity resources will make it possible to accelerate the economy's advance along the path of efficiency and balance. Many participants in the debate correctly noted that it is not a question of resource shortages but of the fact that we mismanage, waste, and at times even plunder them. The main reason is that the cost-based mechanism still functions in our country, with people's earnings rising in proportion with the increase in resource expenditure. Through the fault of the USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs, this mechanism has developed some particularly flawed forms in capital construction over the last 2 years.

The task now is to utilize all instruments of reform which make it possible to eliminate shortages, balance demand and supply on the basis of state orders and prices, and introduce antimonopoly legislation. It is necessary to reduce, or rather release into circulation, the stocks of commodity and material assets accumulated in plant warehouses and depots, whose total value is now in excess of R500 billion.

An important and proper position in the debate on the future of the economic reform was given to the problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress, because our economy's efficiency is determined by the extent of the reform's influence on the accelerated renewal of production potential and the broad utilization of the latest technologies. So far, there has been no success in eliminating negative trends in the sphere of scientific and technical progress. The economy is still not receptive to innovations, and this results in obsolescence of plant and factory equipment and only a slow reduction of the national income's materials-and energy-intensiveness. In order to alter the situation it will be necessary to restructure the organization of scientific research and to channel funds not into the maintenance of institutions but into the solution of major scientific and technical problems. It is important to enhance the role and importance of inventing in the country and ensure that production workers are economically interested in quickly taking obsolete production models off the production lines and getting the latest models in production.

The success of radical reform depends largely on the economic training of cadres. The situation here is alarming. Sociological studies show that almost one-half of leaders and specialists are only vaguely familiar with the essence of the new methods of economic management. One engineer and technician in two lacks the required economic knowledge. This is why the methods of training specialists in higher and secondary specialized education establishments must be renewed immediately and regular courses offered for the retraining or further training of enterprise leaders, engineering and economic staff, and workers. In order to change society, we must change ourselves.

The attention of many local party committees is now focused on questions of perestroyka and the deepening of economic reform. This is good. Reports by rayon and city party committee bureaus and other party committees concentrate on the solution of economic and social problems. In the course of the election campaign, communists and all working people are becoming aware of their direct responsibility for the future of the political and economic reforms. Many labor collectives are elaborating emergency measure programs aimed at improving the state of production, sharply increasing the manufacture of goods, and more successfully solving social questions. Order is being imposed in shops and teams, labor discipline is being strengthened, and a healthy moral and political atmosphere is being created in collectives.

Fundamental importance attaches to the question of where to find funds for the social and economic development of labor collectives. There is increasingly firm rejection of suggestions that many social problems can be solved only through state subsidies or the redistribution of funds, which supposedly requires nothing more than ultimatum demands or strike calls. No, this is not the way to enhance people's living standards, this is not the method by which to deepen and accelerate the radical reform. The most reliable path, making it possible to accelerate the reform and improve the life of all our people, lies only through skilled, well organized, highly productive, and universal labor.

Informals Hold Alternative Revolution Day Parade

PM1611140589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Captain 3d Rank A. Orlov: "An Alternative in Aid of What?"]

[Text] Announcements, mostly posted up at bus stops, were to be seen in many districts of Moscow on the eve of the October Revolution holiday. They announced that an "alternative demonstration" organized by a number of informal organizations would take place in the capital on 7 November while the Red Square demonstration was being held.

The morning of the 7th came. Even from a distance groups of people could be seen around the Dinamo Stadium. A profusion of slogans and placards raised aloft caught one's eye. Naturally one was curious—what sort of slogans were they? "All power to the soviets!" and "We back perestroyka!" I read the first appeals and was perplexed—why was this alternative demonstration needed when columns of people were making their way to the center of Moscow brandishing the very same slogans? Although.... There was a group of young people. They were holding something brand new aloft—a black banner with a red star and the slogan "You have to fight for your rights!"

"Who are these people?"

"They're anarchists...."

"And who else is here today?"

"Everyone!"

Not satisfied with that answer, I set off along the column that was forming up. At its head were the organizers wearing the light-blue armbands of the Moscow Voters' Association and badges in support of the interregional deputies' group. The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee's authorization of the demonstration was being broadcast via a mobile loudspeaker here. It was soon to become plain that the column contained the most diverse views and a fantastic melange of people—there were CPSU members, activists of the Moscow People's Front, anarchists, and members of the "Democratic Union".... The presence of the latter was eloquently signaled by the slogans: "The October Revolution—Russia's Tragedy" and "Send the Soviet partocracy to Nuremberg!"

The column was now ready to move off. But suddenly it turned out to have "two heads," and it was ready to set off in...different directions. There was the Russian People's Front group, which requested the surrounding people to follow it. It announced that Red Square was the ultimate destination. However, apart from the "Democratic Union," no one responded. And two columns set off, each following its own route. The one headed by the "interregionals" (which was the term used among the demonstrators) headed off across Savelovskiy Station Square and Novoslobodskaya Street toward the Sadovoye Koltso beltway. The column was "headed" on its route by USSR People's Deputy T. Gdlyan. He and also Deputies Afanasyev, Popov, and certain others were lauded over the loudspeaker en route.

But the columns did meet up. The Russian People's Front group was ahead of the other demonstrators. It was plain that the "interregionals" were clearly reluctant to merge with the members of the informal Russian People's Front. While ordinary people—city inhabitants who found themselves along the route—were equally reluctant to merge with either. The overwhelming majority of them merely watched, despite insistent appeals for them to "Come along with us!...

"Where to?"—an elderly woman sighed—"You clearly have no idea where you are going yourselves...."

The route to the center of Moscow, where the parade and the usual "nonalternative" festive demonstration of working people meanwhile were making their way, was blocked off the rows of cars usual at this time. The demonstrators began chanting "Down with!" and "Shame!" This was directed at the militia. The public order subunits remained unruffled. These shouts and the chanting came "spontaneously" from within the columns, they did not come from the organizers of the demonstration, but it did leave an unpleasant taste in the mouth.

Finally, having discharged their emotions, the demonstrators turned off Sadovoye Koltso and headed for the Olimpiyskiy sports complex, where an area had been set aside for the sanctioned rally. To be frank, I no longer had any wish to go there....

Article Highlights Current Social, Political Scene

90UN0316A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 11 Nov 89 p 4

[Articles by Richard Kosolapov, former editor of KOMMUNIST: "Stalinism or Still Leninism", and political scientist Yevgeniy Ambartsumov: "Be More Careful on the Turns"]

[Text]

Richard Kosolapov: "Stalinism or Still Leninism"

In any human conversation, not to mention a polemic about principles, a decisive role is played by the ability to listen and to read one's partner, especially one who thinks differently from the way you think. Under the influence of the new political thinking we try to understand our foreign opponents as we would ourselves, discarding the customary "image of the enemy" and delving into logic and arguments. But this does not mean that each has mastered the art of discussion and there is complete mutual understanding in the noisy auditoriums and on the pages of newspapers and magazines. Unfortunately, so far our new thinking exists mainly for export. On our domestic public information market they continue to treat us like small children, regaling us with gremlins and dragons, Mongols and witches who now, as a rule, are called Stalinists and conservatives. I certainly do not deny the fact that all of them exist in the real world, for example, the anarchists and the supporters of the Romanov dynasty, millionaires, and mafiosi. But when a person is called a Stalinist or a conservative not because we have figured out his views, but because one wants to engage in name-calling, then I must protest. The people recall too well the formulaic expression "enemy of the people," and a modern synonym for this can exert a more or less pernicious influence on the fate of many people when the situation is aggravated.

When reading Ye. Ambartsumov's article "Socialism or Stalinism" (SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 19 September 1989, p 2), your humble servant unexpectedly learned much that was new about himself. It seems that I am not only toiling in university fields, but am also holding on to the "wheel of history" in order, along with other "people with malicious intentions," to turn it "in the opposite direction, to return the country and the people to the dark ages of Stalinism." In a secret conspiracy with N. Andreyeva and O. Kazarov, whom I do not know, I "more and more definitely" am casting a "shadow over perestroyka and its motive force—democratization." I am screwing up the works, switching concepts, sounding the alarm, trying to inflame passions, and so forth. God, how can the earth tolerate me any more!

Let us not get mixed up in the journalistic flourishes of Ye. Ambartsumov but go directly to the "shadow" that frightens him. This is my article "Where Is the Ship Sailing..." (MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 August 1989, p 2), in which I expressed a number of questionable ideas about ways of overcoming crises in the CPSU and formulated concrete proposals concerning democratization of life within the party.

Here they are: Increase the number of workers and rank-and-file, unexalted intellectuals on the Central Committee, and elect representatives of this category of communists to the Politburo. Refrain from including ministers and other highly placed leaders on the Central Committee. Change over from multistage elections of rayon, oblast, kray, and republic party committees and the CPSU Central Committee to their direct election in the party organizations on an alternative basis. Restore the Central Control Commission, abolished under Stalin, which is elected along with the Central Committee and is authorized to check on the work of any party committee and any leader from below to above. Do not allow one person to hold the position of general secretary for life and limit the term in office to the period between congresses. Legalize the possibility of presenting competing ideological- political platforms within the party without being limited to the one proposed by the central party apparatus. Change the practice of self-remuneration by the individuals who provide the country's highest leadership. Abolish benefits and privileges allowed only to the nomenklatura. Purge the party apparatus of bourgeois elements, and so forth.

It is obvious to any normal person that all of these proposals are made strictly in the spirit of the latest Leninist recommendations. They follow the line of activization of lower party levels and transformation of the CPSU from a party of the apparatus into a party of the masses. But for Ye. Ambartsumov, in spite of common sense, it is this that is the "dark ages of Stalinism." In my opinion, with all the various kinds of absurdity with which the modern press is dotted, nobody has reached this point of absurdity heretofore. To equate a consistent development of the ideas of Lenin's legacy with Stalinism, conservatism, and so forth means to cast a shadow on a clear day and rudely stack the deck in the political card game.

Ye. Ambartsumov arbitrarily reduces my proposals to the following two: a) a purge of the party apparatus, "which is in harmony," in his words, "with N. Andreyeva's appeals for fixing boundaries (although purging is a two-edged sword and it is not known who will be the victim)"; and b) a limitation of the term in office of the general secretary of the Central Committee to one period between congresses or the elimination of this post altogether. He considers the latter to be the most essential, although from my viewpoint the most essential thing is to provide for a preponderance of the working class, the kolkhoz [collective farm] peasantry, and the working intelligentsia in the Central Committee; the direct participation of all communists in the election of party committees at all levels, including the Central Committee; and the elimination of the gap in consumption patterns between the party workers and the rest of the workers.

Ye. Ambartsumov deliberately leaves out the arguments for my proposal concerning purging the party apparatus and thus makes it sound absurd. He gives the reader the impression that I am calling for some kind of indiscriminate general purge. But what I am bothered by is a quite particular decadent phenomenon. I am writing about the fact that during the years of stagnation among party workers there was "formed a stratum of people drawn to bourgeois standards of life and the arrangement of mutually advantageous ties with those who in one way or another participate in the distribution of goods, including questionable elements, not ruling out foreigners. The purge of the party apparatus of such people who essentially contribute to bribery and drug addition, who are moral philistines," I emphasize in my article, "would contribute a great deal to improving the situation in the party and the society and would be of great educational significance." Emasculating this statement to meet his own specifications, Ye. Ambartsumov essentially protects the corrupt party bureaucrats and tries to draw a questionable analogy with N. Andreyeva's appeal for delimitation. "...A purge is a two-edged sword," the journalist notes, "and we do not know who will be purged...." There you have it! For this statement means nothing other than a hint that those whom Ye. Ambartsumov is hiding in the shadow of his phrases could purge honest communists and not vice versa. I think that this unique "generalization" deserves to go down in the annals of perestroyka.

"It is apparent," Ye. Ambartsumov summarizes, "that O. Kazarov, like N. Andreyeva and R. Kosolapov, sees the cause of our current troubles in perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost." I have not analyzed the work of O. Kazarov and N. Andreyeva and I have no opinion about them, but as concerns my own work, I dismiss Ye. Ambartsumov's assertion as crude slander. Ye. Ambartsumov wants to accuse me, perhaps in jest, of "undermining the effectiveness of the central authority," but since he has no factual evidence of this, he skillfully maneuvers, as though defending M.S. Gorbachev from me and someone else. In the words of the journalist, his leadership "of course, relying on the people, is today the only possible practical guarantee of the continuation of perestroyka." Such a skillful juxtaposition of individuals with obviously different capabilities is a not altogether moral polemical device that proved itself long ago and was widely used in Stalin's times. I do not argue with Ye. Ambartsumov's viewpoint regarding the position of a specific leader in perestroyka, although I do not consider this position to be final. I am bothered by something else: Allowing the post of general secretary to be held for life, regardless of who holds it, as long and bitter experience has shown, produces no advantage either for the party or for Soviet society. Lenin worked for 5 years on the Sovnarkom [Soviet of People's Commissars] without any fancy title and yet he left us an invaluable practical, theoretical, and moral legacy. We must finally learn from history.

I understand that Ye. Ambartsumov is concerned about attempts on the part of antidemocratic and conservative forces and I am ready to help him here. Just so that he does not have to go chasing after phantoms and witches in vain, I shall give him the address. It is linked to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

In issue No 33 for 1989 (p 10) Doctor of Sciences I. Klyamkin and Candidate of Sciences A. Migranyan did nothing more or less than speak out against further democratization. It would seem that this long-awaited and fruitful process had just begun, and now yesterday's fervent proponents of it have sounded the alarm. You see they think that the cause of the reforms can be saved only by a one-man "democratic dictatorship." We had not managed to placate our compatriots with open broadcasts from the meetings of the highest organs of power before there began to flicker on the screens of our television sets now the cap of Monomakh, now the triangular hat, now the military hat of the generalissimos. Again shadows....

Why do the "progressives," who have constructed more than one dacha with their honoraria from criticizing the cult of the personality and Stalinism, suddenly want totalitarianism and adventurism? There is nothing mysterious in this. They are simply bothered by the fact that "the masses are bursting into politics along with their interests, but they do not have the necessary mechanism that can digest and harmonize all this." Therefore it is better to carry out perestroyka without the masses and in spite of them. I am told that good people who think this way are still not Stalinists and belong to the educated class. But this is not a matter of names. "By 'Bonapartist'," wrote Shchedrin, "I mean anyone who confuses the expression 'fatherland' with the expression 'your excellency' and even gives preference to the latter over the former." In what way are our anti-Stalinists not Bonapartists? And in general are our gallant new theoreticians of the "iron hand" really very far from Stalinism?

Another address which I shall give Ye. Ambartsumov is that of a conservative who does not try to hide his sympathies and even emphatically shows them. I have in mind the well-known economist and writer People's Deputy N. Shmelev, "...I consider myself a person with deeply conservative convictions," he confessed in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, "and in my entire life I do not recall a single new idea that has appeared in my head. If my judgments have an element of innovation, it is only according to the principle: The new is always the old that has been well forgotten" (1989, No 30, p 12). N. Shmelev seriously considers the healthiest view of life to be that of the philistine. He blames the influence of great ideas for the fact that philistine morality has not been established here. His economic formulas are also straightforwardly conservative: He thinks that the way out of the crisis of our country's national economy is "promised" on the paths of restoration of premonopolistic private property. Such a candid conservative is a real find for a journalist. Instead of giving in to his fantasies about my "Stalinism," it would be better for Ye. Ambartsumov to deal with real material.

One cannot but relish Ye. Ambartsumov's satirical gift when he writes about the lonely standard bearers who go to the bottom along with the rusted-out ship of Stalinism and the true champions of socialism who have been able to switch to a more reliable vessel in time. Among the former, of course, one can find the author of these lines, and among the latter—his critics. But he who laughs last laughs best. And Ye. Ambartsumov does not know that real socialism appeared a century and a half ago, and it seems to him that "instead of true needs, the need for truth, and instead of the interests of the proletariat, he is defending the interests of the human essence, the interests of man in general, man who does not belong to any class and in general exists not in reality, but in the misty heavens of philosophical fantasy." Where are his champions now? The "true" socialism of Ye. Ambartsumov, which has placed an equal sign between the "darkness of Stalinism" and the last word of Lenin, will not be likely to avoid this same fate. With AIDS-beclouded thinking and deception in general it is impossible to build anything durable, although it is possible to keep something afloat for a certain amount of time. Socialism is viable only with a vital connection with the mass worker and communist movement, which in this country is represented by healthy forces in the CPSU and trade unions and the United Workers Front, which appeared spontaneously. Without this movement and the heroic standard bearers the "real champions of socialism" are doomed.

Ye. Ambartsumov is interesting as a moralist. Thus he reproaches N. Andreyeva for "borrowing even the polemical devices of her teacher—stacking the deck and significant reticence, distortion of facts, and straightforward slander." But what can be said about Ye. Ambartsumov himself in light of what has just been presented? Physician, heal thyself! Ye. Ambartsumov, as if in passing, throws out a remark I made in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA "after a long recess...." It would be better for him not to touch upon this subject. Ye. Ambartsumov probably knows that the professional social scientist and the journalist are not in a position to voluntarily remain silent in such turbulent times. It is not that I would not risk speaking out "too loudly," but that because of the vagaries of our young glasnost I have not been given a large forum. Now when I am writing these words I still have a question as to whether or not they will make their way into print. And, after all, this is a question of the calling of the intellectual for whom the worst tragedy is a lack of demand for his intelligence.

Having taken up my pen in a fit of temper, at first I wanted to write a biting essay, but then I thought better of it. What would be the point if out of revenge for being compared to the well-known Leningrader, I liken Ye. Ambartsumov, say, to Charlotte Corday and Fannie Kaplan? One way or another these women with all their fury became historical personalities and it would be difficult to promise this to Ye. Ambartsumov. But there is something else in this parallel. If one forgets about the surnames and looks only at the given names, for example, one can let one's imagination play and speak about the Charlottes and Fannies of our current journalism. But such a discussion would lead us far off the track, and the response to Ye. Ambartsumov has dragged on too long anyway.

I shall conclude it briefly:

Do not slander your party comrades; do not let your colleagues down; be frank with children; do not deceive women unless they ask for it; and do not lie on the pages of the press. Perestroyka does not need this.

Yevgeniy Ambartsumov: "Be More Careful on the Turns!"

I did not think that a couple of sarcastic phrases to R. Kosolapov would evoke such an inappropriate response from him, and not just to me. He comes down on all modern journalism and the press. It was an entirely different thing that 6 or 7 years ago during the period of the notorious stagnation when he was in charge of the magazine KOMMUNIST, which was cherished by our gerontocracy, he sang the praises of the works and accomplishments of Brezhnev, Suslov, Grishin, and Romanov and railed against writers and social scientists, who tried to draw attention to the ever-worsening problems in the life of our society.

As we know, the style is the person, and today's readers can see with their own eyes that our press lost something when Richard Ivanovich left the political scene. Now he considers himself—and says so in all seriousness—to be in the position of an unneeded intellectual.

R.I. Kosolapov when he was at the ideological helm and called for us "not to be lulled by incantations in the spirit of abstract humanism" (I am quoting from his monograph "Socialism. Toward Questions of Theory," 2d ed. 1979, p 105) and was attacking with the heavy artillery of his theoretical profundity the "groundlessness of bourgeois speculations on the problem of freedom" (p 12) and also especially modern revisionists and others who doubted the high qualities of Stalinist-Brezhnevian socialism—well, this same Richard Kosolapov today is presenting his proposals for "democratization of party life." At first glance many of them may seem reasonable (although they were not conceived by R. Kosolapov). And it is quite pleasing to today's reader to hear the malicious jabs from R.I. against the social privileges of the party apparatus and against the racketeers, bribe takers, and embezzlers. But let us repeat an old phrase: Look who is talking. I recall that for two terms—that is, 10 years—R.I. Kosolapov was in the CPSU Central Committee and for approximately the same amount of time before that he worked in the central party apparatus. Because of his position he enjoyed certain privileges although, as it is suddenly being explained now (see his article in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA of 2 August), he considers them an anachronism. But still even though it was with a sad heart, he did not refuse them—that would not have been democratic. Even with respect to the dacha issue, he acted out of principle. But he did have a fling at the progressives who supposedly built "more than one dacha using honoraria for criticizing the cult of the personality and Stalinism."

In today's article R.I. Kosolapov does not mention the lost benefits, although only 3 months ago in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA he could not refrain from giving in to nostalgia and condemned the "myths" about closed dacha villages (where he himself lived). And he advised: "Departmental medical institutions, dining rooms, and stores might have existed." Although this understandable nostalgia contradicts the author's invective against privileges.

Another question arises for R. Kosolapov, who today so emphatically proclaims his adherence to democratic ideas. Why did he not defend them previously when he was at the ideological top of the heap? And if he is such a fighter for truth, why does he remain silent today about his past, quite undemocratic sins? In MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA he admitted that "direct access to Brezhnev was closed off by such 'monstrous phenomena as Rashidovism, Kunayevism, Shchelokovism, and so forth.'" What is this, self-criticism? For it is known that the editor in chief of KOMMUNIST at that time had direct access to Brezhnev and especially to Chernenko, and that Rashidov, Kunayev, Shchelokov, and Grishin were printed and in all ways promoted and elevated in his magazine. Now, by castigating the former leaders of stagnation, R.I. Kosolapov is obviously showing off his adherence to principles and his rapture about perestroyka.

Here it is necessary to mention Professor Kosolapov's theoretical positions. I do not intend to cast doubt upon the notion that he is unmarred by "Shchelokovism and so forth," but I think that the economic dogmas he has planted—such, for example, as apologetics for "the single-structure socialist system," that is, state-monopolistic ownership, and the demand to give automatic preference to state management over cooperative—these have caused harm to our society which more then exceeds the consequences of "Shchelokovism." R.I. Kosolapov was practically the main spokesman for the so-called "developed socialism." In the Soviet Union, he asserted on page 42 of his monograph, "a basis is being laid for the reign of freedom and social and national antagonism is being eliminated" and on page 13 he condemned the "dulling of our vigilance." He himself actively promoted and turned KOMMUNIST into a forum for promoting adventuristic views whose domination led the Soviet economy into an impasse.

R.I. loves to evoke the shadow of Shchedrin, which is not without danger. For it was Shchedrin who depicted the retired bureaucrat, a mind reader by the name of Udav. The concept of these Udavs who reveled in their ideological superficiality was clear: We have nothing to learn from the Germans. While they are sweating over "accumulation," we are on the brink of abolishing the political economy altogether. Do you recognize this, R.I.?

In an article in what was then OKTYABR, "The Dialectic of Our Life" (subsequently included in a collection of his literary (!) works), R. Kosolapov oriented our economy and social relations to continuous industrialization, the transformation of agrarian labor into a variety of industrial labor, and the erasure of the differences between kolkhoz [collective farm] peasants and city workers. Following these guidelines, under Brezhnev and Chernenko we actually did succeed in overcoming the boundaries between classes, having transformed almost all the citizens into state employees, and we achieved the sought-after social homogeneity (R.I. naturally remains silent about the privileged stratum of bureaucrats and corrupt politicians), but then we lost the peasantry—the backbone of the society—and the food products along with them.

In his book R. Kosolapov praised the "emerging communist society," the "model of the corresponding form of social labor in the form of self-service in public catering institutions, training institutions, dormitories, and so forth, which considerably raises the level of consumer service for the Soviet people" (p 286). Now these words are perceived as parody but they were written in earnest and were passed off as a model of Marxist theory.

Our author, however, is not aware of the humor in the situation and continues today to advise its "restoration or its creation anew, the construction of communal structures (were the apartments described by Zoshchenko not communal) and it is this, in his opinion, that should lead to the "desired pluralism in the Soviet way of life" (VESTNIK MGU, series 12, 1989, No 4, p 58).

The summit of R. Kosolapov's theoretical profundity was his thesis on "socialism as integrity." Disdaining the intellectual's knowledge of foreign languages, he did not catch that this term is a smoothed-out translation of the German term for "totality," which leads directly to totalitarianism, and today he is accusing Klyamkin and Migranyan of this although they have absolutely nothing to do with it. Either accidentally or on purpose he juggles things when he equates totalitarianism, which Klyamkin and Migranyan resolutely reject, with authoritarianism, which they consider expedient under current conditions. I critically analyze this publication of my colleagues in a response which I sent to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and therefore I shall not repeat it now: I wish simply to defend from accusations of conservatism and Stalinism those who are defending the idea of strong central power for purposes of being released from the legacy of Stalinism.

Incidentally, it will do no good for R.I. himself to deny Stalinism today. For in his monograph he was the first person writing in our literature since the 20th congress to undertake a theoretical rehabilitation of Stalin, especially his last dogmatic work, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," although he did criticize certain particulars. At the same time he did and still does remain silent about Stalin's crimes against his own people. Is this not why he declined to evaluate the neo-Stalinist writings of Nina Andreyeva and is standing up in her defense?

R. Kosolapov still believes in the Stalinist theoretical utopia about the nearness of communism, but at the same time he is put off by the pragmatic orientation not toward a utopia but toward current needs (see his article in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA), that is, the normal orientation of a society toward the fastest satisfaction of the needs of its members. In MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA he expressed the idea that "we rejected the idea of the dictatorship of the working class too soon and it should be restored." In combination with a reminder of Stalin's humble rejection of the title of general secretary, this can be understood as nostalgia for Stalinist times when monstrous arbitrary rule was practiced under the screen of "the Stalinist constitution, the most democratic in the world."

I am going into such detail about Kosolapov's theorizing because, unfortunately, it has exerted a fatal, stunning influence on many of our young social scientists. They have swallowed the bait of external profundity, a game of stringing concepts together, which at first glance looks better than the dogmatism of even more primitive teachers. But, it is six of one and a half dozen of the other. Therefore I think that R. Kosolapov bears a good deal of personal responsibility for the degradation of our social science under Brezhnev and Chernenko and for diverting attention from the problems of real life and burdening us with imagined and illusory problems.

Now about R. Kosolapov's political proposals which he has repeated today. The idea of them is to contrast the random informal activity of the people (even when he was at KOMMUNIST R. Kosolapov was especially up in arms against randomness, which he contrasted to the deliberateness of the "revolutionary science about society—scientific communism") to the "healthy forces in the CPSU and the trade unions"—the "united fronts of workers" (see VESTNIK MGU) which have already unmasked themselves as the caprice of the conservative apparatus forces of the old stripe who tried to take revenge for their defeat in the elections and protect themselves from a complete loss of power.

R. Kosolapov suggests establishing a quantitative quota for workers in the Central Committee and the Politburo—one-third—and here he refers to Lenin (who said nothing of the kind) and cloaks his proposal in the instruction concerning introducing Central Committee workers in his own way. How can one not recall that after Lenin's death Stalin resorted to the ostentatious and equally absurd "proletarization" of the party in order to dilute the Leninist guard with an easily manipulated mass. But Lenin suggested bringing into the party not token workers, but rank-and-file, independently thinking workers. That is the essence. Under Brezhnev and Chernenko there was an abundance of token workers, along with R. Kosolapov, incidentally, in the Supreme Soviet. And they were obediently silent, voted unanimously for Brezhnev and Chernenko, and did not protest with either words or hints. Under this kind of "worker" cover it was easier for the conservative corrupt bureaucracy to wheel and deal. Is it not R. Kosolapov's dream to return to this situation?

But the current party leadership, specifically M.S. Gorbachev, is keeping the dreams of the new and uninvited caretakers of the "interests of the working class" from coming true. Understandably, R. Kosolapov will not say this openly. He beats around the bush. Without naming the general secretary by name, he advises against having this post held for life. But has Gorbachev ever laid claim to anything of the kind?

In VESTNIK MGU my opponent expresses himself even more definitely, speaking in favor of forming another party to compete with the CPSU, "with a Marxist-Leninist platform," "but with different methods of analysis, ... according to the methods of work with the masses." We remember these methods from the history of the thirties and later years as well. And who will be the ideologist for this party—will it not be Richard Ivanovich himself?

Our leadership should think about where the organizers of the caprices with the united worker front are headed. It would not hurt certain of our radicals to think either, those who criticize M.S. Gorbachev, sometimes not without justification, but with such exaggeration that one wants to recall: If you go too sharply to the left you will arrive at the right.

R. Kosolapov complains that with glasnost he has not been given a large forum. I recall well how criticism from KOMMUNIST when it was edited by Kosolapov immediately closed the door to the press against the person who was criticized—and not only to the press. But today I am glad that SOVETSKAYA KULTURA is printing the letter from R.I. and my response to him in full. That would have been simply impossible on the pages of the former KOMMUNIST.

Well, I do not wish to close my response with incantations in the spirit of Richard Ivanovich. Let him say what he will—the reader will figure out who is right.

Economic

Latest Price Policy Measures Explained

904A0063A Moscow TRUD in Russian
12 Nov 89 p 1

[Article by V. Golovachev: "What Will Happen With Prices?"]

[Text] Proposals on additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and to strengthen state control over prices have been submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In the recent past, journalists were not frequent visitors in Kremlin offices. Today, representatives of the media regularly attend the most important meetings of the USSR Council of Ministers. Recently they were even invited to the military-industrial commission, whose very name was a secret previously. The doors to the office of Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chief of the USSR Council of Ministers, are always open to the press. He meets frequently with journalists and, not sidestepping critical issues and not concealing his personal opinions, he explains frankly, and he argues about the economic situation in the country, and about measures that are being instituted. A regular meeting of this kind was held late in the evening on Friday, 10 November. The discussion was principally about prices.

As is known, our trade unions came out with an announcement that it is necessary to halt the increase in prices. It received a great public response. Taking into account the adopted decree "On the Taxation of the Wage Fund of State Enterprises (Associations)," which limits the growth of the monetary income of workers until 1991, it is necessary for the same period also, the trade unions emphasize, to "freeze" both the price for basic foodstuffs and for industrial commodities that make up a subsistence minimum and the "consumer goods basket," and to establish strict control over these prices on the part of the state.

The USSR Supreme Soviet instructed the government to develop appropriate measures and to submit proposals by 1 November. At exactly the indicated time, N.I. Ryzhkov, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, submitted proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet about additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and to strengthen state control over prices. This is the fruit of the joint work of the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Economic Reform, the AUCCTU [All-Union Council of Trade Unions], Goskomtsen [State Committee on Prices], scientific institutes, and other organizations.

What is characteristic of these proposals? The systems approach to the resolution of problems. Three basic elements of the market are bound together here: The supply and demand of goods and prices.

How are we to fight inflation? Indeed, just what is inflation? It is now frequently identified with an increase in prices, which, of course, is not true. Inflation has many components, and an increase in prices is only one of them. Unfortunately, up until now there has been no single and accurate methodology of calculation; therefore, the figures "are unsteady;" they evoke bewilderment among people, and frequently disbelief in published data.

In addition to an increase in prices, the other elements of inflation are the issuance of money that is not covered by a corresponding value of goods, a budget deficit, and, finally, the most unpleasant aspect, a severe shortage of goods. This is also inflation: There is money, but it is not possible to buy needed goods with it. According to data of the institute of the state of the market, out of a thousand commodities that are monitored, only 100-120 are sold without interruptions.

On the whole, the inflation index, according to the calculations of various scientific institutes, vacillates from 5-6 to 10-11 percent in the consumer sector.

Today the list of unsatisfied demand items includes not only meat, butter, and milk, but also flour, cereals, and even ice cream. The list also includes fabrics, clothing, shoes, carpets (with which stores were previously overstocked), household chemical goods, synthetic detergents, soap, perfumes, and fancy goods.

The proposed measures are directed precisely at the stabilization of the consumer market, on strengthening price controls, and on an increase in the output of basic necessities. For this, it is proposed to suspend, for the fourth quarter of this year and for 1990, the operation of Paragraph 10 of Article 17 of the USSR Law "On State Enterprises (Associations)." The question concerns the establishment of stipulated prices for basic food items that are sold by state trade. In many ways stipulated prices promote high prices. Now enterprises are deprived of the right to establish stipulated prices without controls for the basic types of food stuffs and also for certain groups of socially important non-food commodities, principally for children and older people.

The operation of Article 19 of the Law on State Enterprises is also suspended in the part on the export of consumer goods and the raw materials for their production above the quotas set by the plan. Under conditions of an unsaturated market, the rights given to enterprises have generated a rather negative phenomenon: Deliveries for export have increased sharply to the detriment of the domestic market. Minrybkhoz [Ministry of the Fish Industry], for example, interrupted delivery of products for the domestic market in the amount of 700,000 tons (that is, it is calculated that each inhabitant of the country received 2.5 kilograms less of fish and fish products). But then 400,000 tons of this important type of food was shipped abroad. Similar examples can also be cited for a number of other commodities. That is why it is proposed to introduce the licensing of consumer commodities for export and the basic types of raw materials for their production. Many questions associated with control over the level of prices and an increase in the output of commodities will have to be resolved by the Supreme Soviets of the union republics and by local organs of authority. For example, it is proposed that they, depending on local conditions, adopt measures to expand and refine the list of commodities of the light industry that are being sold at socially low prices. There is one more proposal for the republic and local organs: To examine the question about establishing maximum retail prices, differentiated according to season, for the most important fruit and vegetable products and potatoes, to increase control over the correctness of their application, where necessary using subsidies from local budgets for reimbursing the difference between these and contracted purchase prices.

State orders should provide for an expansion in the production and delivery to the market of the most important light industry commodities of a cultural-welfare and household purpose.

Supplements to the submitted document present proposals for "base" prices for commodities for children and elderly persons. For example, a dress made of cotton fabric for nursery or pre-school age children should not cost more than R4, trousers for pupils—up to R8, suits for elderly persons—up to R80, raincoats—up to R65, trousers—up to R23, low shoes—up to R10, etc. We repeat that this is still only a proposal, but the figures are a graphic portrayal of the nature of the document. It also envisions defining the procedure for the sale of these items so that they are used strictly as intended.

The USSR Council of Ministers is implementing measures to strengthen state price control. A list of commodities in general demand and the level of state retail prices which must be maintained without changes has been formulated. This includes meat and meat products, the main types of fish and canned fish, animal oil, edible animal fat, vegetable oil, margarine.... The list also includes milk and milk products, cheese, eggs, sugar, natural tea, salt, flour, and bread bakery products. Also listed are cereal and legumes, and macaroni items, child and dietetic foods, school-writing articles, and a number of other items.

This question was asked at the meeting: When will there be an end to the irregularities in the most vital commodities, which is causing particular discontent among the population? The adopted measures will make it possible to ease the deficit noticeably by the end of this year in such commodities as synthetic detergents, toothpaste, school uniforms, notebooks, women's panty hose, zippers, batteries, shaving blades, electric irons, needles for sewing machines, tobacco items, and laundry and toilet soap, and they will make it possible to improve the supply of popular medical preparations.

"Who initiated the proposal to increase the price of beer, tobacco, and other items," the journalists asked.

"For some reason it is believed that this is an initiative of the government," noted L.I. Abalkin. "But these were proposals of the commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. As is known, the Supreme Soviet itself did not support these proposals."

"What plans will be undertaken to saturate the market with long-term use items, for example, passenger cars?"

"It has been decided not to provide passenger vehicles to central establishments, organizations, party, and trade union organs, and so forth, for official purposes. All of these vehicles (and there will be quite a few) will enter the consumer market, where they will be sold at auctions."

"There is a lot of talk about monetary reform...."

"I believe that the adoption of monetary reform is an absolutely ineffective measure," L.I. Abalkin emphasized.

"And the adoption of ration cards everywhere?"

"This also does not resolve the problem...."

Of course, it is not possible in a newspaper report to recount all questions that were discussed at the meeting during two and a half hours. The main thing is that we became convinced: The social questions that especially disturb the trade unions and all of the workers occupy a paramount place in the activity of the government. This can only be welcomed in every possible way.

Krasnodar To Stagger Work Week To Save Power

PM2711141189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Udachin report: "Rest Days For the Winter. Electricity Shortage Forces Deputies to Make Difficult Decision"]

[Text] Krasnodar Kray—This topic did not appear on the agenda of the last session of the Krasnodar Kray Soviet Executive Committee [krayispolkom]; it was raised by deputies. Because winter is coming, and the electricity shortage in the kray is acute and of long standing. There are few energy producers here—power mainly comes from neighboring regions. But a menacing situation has taken shape this year owing to the shutdown of the Armenian nuclear electric power station [AES], the delay in commissioning the Rostov AES, and the failure to carry out the planned repairs at the Azerbaijan and Tbilisi state regional electric power stations and owing to the poor reliability of existing power grids. How are we to get through the winter, provide the kray's inhabitants with a normal electricity supply, and ensure the stable operation of its economic complex?

N. Kondratenko, chairman of the krayispolkom, submitted two options for overcoming the difficult situation for the deputies' verdict. The first is well known to the people of the Kuban—and not only to them. It is the so-called "rotation" schedule, whereby a particular group of consumers are disconnected every day. The "rotation system" has its merits, but it inflicts considerable damage: In order to reduce the load by the required 140,000 kilowatts, the kray's 200 industrial enterprises need to be disconnected for 1 and ½ hours in the evening. The "Novorostsement" Combine loses production worth R22,500 in that time, while Krasnodar's Sedin and Kalinin machine tool plants lose production valued at R46,000 and the "Chayka" china and pottery plant loses production of consumer goods worth more than R25,000. Some 80 social facilities—kindergartens, schools, hospitals, boiler houses, and large apartment blocks—will inevitably be cut off. It is not impossible that costly equipment requiring continuous operation could be put out of action.

The second option is fundamentally different. It is well known that energy consumption on Saturdays and Sundays is considerably less than on working days. The North Caucasus power grid shows less of a power shortfall on nonwork days. That is why the krayispolkom also proposed a scheme to deputies for moving nonwork days around according to city and rayon. Under this scheme, consumers are grouped into five zones with approximately equal capacities. Nonwork days, which are obligatory for all establishments, enterprises, and organizations, are fixed for each zone, while Saturday is deemed a general kray work day for kray services. Although this option has moral problems (disruption of the established structure and the abandoning of the country's unified working and cultural life), they are nonetheless far fewer than the economic losses.

That is why, having weighed up all the circumstances, the krayispolkom session voted in favor of the second option—swapping the week's nonwork days and work days. It probably will not delight the people of the Kuban, but the session's decision is reasonable in this situation. Certainly, winter does not last forever. Something else is not quite clear: What are the prospects of providing the kray with the requisite electricity?

Commission To Study Norilsk Gas Pipeline Blast

LD1811225389 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—The consequences of a gas pipeline explosion which took place on the night of November 14-15 300 kilometres off Norilsk are felt by the city residents and enterprises, the newspaper IZVESTIYA said today.

The Norilsk mining-metallurgical works has restricted production to the minimum. Houses are heated by reserve fuel. The temperature in apartment blocks does not exceed 12 degrees above zero. Lessons have been cancelled at some schools.

The powerful explosion occurred in a section attached to the compressor station. It damaged more than 40 kilometres of the pipeline which supplies gas to thermoelectric plants of the Norilsk industrial region. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the blast had taken place at the pipeline's joints and damaged all the three lines. Besides, the temperature before and after the explosion was minus 41 and the force of wind was about 30 metres per second.

What was the reason for the explosion? The state commission will answer this question. According to preliminary forecasts, the crack in the line could be caused by a sharp temperature difference from minus four to minus 41 degrees centigrade.

The pipeline is expected to be temporarily restored by November 21, but it will take more time to restore it completely.

Agricultural

Agricultural Report for 16-21 Nov Period

LD2311020589

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 16-21 November, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

16 November

the farmers of Kabarda-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic have delivered 220,000 tonnes of selected bread grains to reception points. This amount is in excess of the state order and thereby completes sales to the state. Practically all the wheat is of a strong and valuable variety. (1600)

17 November

No relevant items

18 November

One million tonnes of sugar beet have been processed by Tambov Oblast refineries, thereby fulfilling the state order for sugar production ahead of schedule; 115,000 tonnes of sugar have already been sent to the Urals, Siberia, and the Far East. (1400)

19 november

Stavropol Kray: This year the kray's growers have achieved a yield of 30 quintals of grain per hectare, meeting their state commitments and leaving themselves some grain. The state order for maize grain deliveries has been fulfilled. A total of 150,000 tonnes has been delivered. The kray's sugar beet complex has fulfilled its state orders. Over 1 million tonnes of sugar beet has been delivered for processing. Over the past 3 years as many agricultural processing enterprises have been built in the kray as in all the previous years of Soviet power. Many people are moving into rural areas where just recently there was a shortage of labor. Many new buildings are being put up. (0900)

Moldavia: The volume of food products produced in the first 9 months of the year increased 1.1 percent compared to the same period last year. Over a third of the yield of vegetables, especially tomatoes, still gets wasted. The plan for the construction of agrocomplex storage facilities has only been fulfilled by 47 percent. Therefore, the construction of cold storage facilities is not progressing very well. Meanwhile, there is extensive construction in the social sphere and villages are growing. (0900)

20 November

Uzbek radio talks of the cotton situation in (Inay Indushan) in Uzbekistan. More than 5,258,000 tonnes of raw cotton have been sent to storage places, which is more than the state ordered. Almost three quarters of the harvest collected is first grade. The main feature of the success is the wide use of cotton picking machines of which there are more than 28,000, each picking on average almost 100 tonnes of cotton. If the Uzbek farms were financially independent then these figures would be even better as they would be free to sell all the cotton harvested above the plan's schedule and this would give them more incentive to produce more. (0900)

21 November

In the Ukraine 2,330,000 tonnes of sunflower seeds have been received at the acceptance points. The state order has thus been fulfilled, and the quality is better than last year. (0700)

Agricultural workers in Tajikistan have fulfilled the plan for the sale of cotton. A total of over 887,000 tonnes of raw cotton has arrived at procurement centers of cotton-processing associations and works. (1430)

Scientific

Cosmos '2,051' in Orbit; 'Functioning Normally'

LD2711135489 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—Another satellite in the Cosmos series, the Cosmos-2,051, was launched in the Soviet Union on Saturday.

The satellite, intended for the continuation of space research, was put into an orbit with the following parameters:

—Initial orbital period—92.8 minutes,
—The maximum distance from the earth's surface—456 km,
—The minimum distance from the earth's surface—305 km,
—Orbital inclination—64.8 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

'Kvant-2' Systems Shut Down To Conserve Energy

LD2711181489 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—The Soviet space module Kvant-2 is now in its second day of flight. it is to add to the Mir orbital space complex some additional equipment and instruments to broaden the scope of research and experiments carried out in the interests of science and the economy.

The cargo delivered by the Kvant-2 contains fuel as well as food and water for Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov who continue their work in orbit.

According to telemetric information received from the module during the first communications session, one of the two panels of the solar battery has failed to unfold completely.

Flight control Centre officials told TASS that attempts to open the solar battery using the module's onboard equipment controlled from earth have so far failed. Flight control specialists have switched off some of the module's systems to "save its energy resources".

'Zenit' Booster Rocket in Final Test Stage

LD2411224989 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 24 NOV 89

[Text] In the Soviet Union trial tests are now in the final stage of a new powerful booster rocket, Zenit. This follows an announcement to the press by (Yuriy Koktev), an official for the Ministry of General Machine building producing space technology.

The new rocket, taking into orbit a payload of 12 tonnes is to replace the Soyuz booster, currently in use for launching all Soviet space crafts.

Controversy Over South Urals AES Continues

904E0026A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by D. Usachev and A. Usoltska, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA special correspondents: "A Nuclear Deadlock: Can a Nuclear Power Plant Save Us from Radioactive Contamination"]

[Text] "I do not want to be a mutant"—we saw these penetrating words, written in a child's handwriting on a sheet of Whatman drawing paper, at a meeting in Chelyabinsk. It was not the first time that the problem had been discussed here: Do the South Urals need a nuclear electric power plant? The public is anxious. The Beloyarskaya AES has been in operation in the Urals since the 1960's. Construction of yet another nuclear power plant was begun without taking into consideration the opinions of the residents. Moreover, the administration of the Chelyabinskenergo AES did not order and the Chelyabinsk oblispolkom did not allot land for the construction site. It was not the timely ecological plan of a board of experts. For this reason, the people are demanding that a referendum be held, which would determine the fate of the construction project.

It is simplest to accuse the Ural residents of radiophobia. After the Chernobyl tragedy, the attitude of most people toward nuclear power was in general extremely cautious. The South Urals, however, have particular grounds for protest.

"In September 1957, my daughter was four months old," says Gulfida Gabitovna Nigmatullina. "At that time we were living in the country in Satlikovo-Kaslinskiy Rayon. At sunset I took a scythe and went into the meadow with my daughter at my breast. I placed the child in a little shrubbery and I was working. A car with soldiers came up and they took out some sort of instruments. 'Mamasha,' they said to me, 'you must not be here, there is radiation, do let us take you away.' Even though they resettled all of us, my daughter died of leukemia six months later."

A soundless death has come over the Ural villages. On 29 September 1957, there was an accident at a nuclear defense project located between the old cities of Kyshtym and Kasli. It was recounted in detail at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 3 July 1989, by L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At that time, everyone treated the dread atom pretty much in his own way. At first they simply poured the radioactive wastes into the river, and the radionuclides went along the Ural and Siberian rivers until they reached right up to the Arctic Ocean. Then they suddenly had a thought, and built artificial reservoirs for the wastes, and constructed concrete tanks. It was with those that the tragedy is connected: Heat was evolved and then there was an explosion. Its echo still resounds. A radioactive cloud covered a large territory in Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk and Tyumen Oblasts. Dozens of population centers and the inhabitants of 33 villages in the zone of the calamity had to be evacuated. The village of Satlykovo, where G.G. Nigmatullina lived, disappeared. In general, northeast of Kasli today there is a unique "blank spot" on the map. Over 10,000 persons were moved out of the territory with traces of radioactivity and another 7000—from the banks of the toxic river Techa. About 16,000 hectares, the most contaminated, were removed from farming circulation and blasphemously declared "preserves."

The main arguments of the adherents of the nuclear power plant are related to solving the problem of the "dead lakes." They began to build the plant right here, near the defense project. According to the testimony of that same L.D. Ryabev, in Lake Karachay alone, 120 million curies of radioactivity—almost 2.5-fold more than was emitted (according to official data) at Chernobyl—have accumulated. The Mayak Chemical Combine, in operation here, by consuming contaminated water for its needs, regulated the water level in the lakes. In connection with the conversion, however, one of the nuclear reactors, producing plutonium, has already been shut down, and the others will be next. This, specialists confirm, will become a new danger—overfilling the reservoirs with natural water and, consequently, diffusion of radioactive wastes and the possibility of the breakthrough of a tremendous mass of contaminated run-off, which will go off into the rivers of the Ob basin.

According to the plan of the designers, it is precisely an AES that is capable of averting this sort of catastrophe. The plant, they say, will make use of the radioactive water to cool the turbine condensers, thus contributing to its increased evaporation.

Let us now listen to their opponents.

"This is a perpetual nuclear deadlock," feels S.G. Kozlov, sanitation physician of the Division of Radiation Hygiene of the Chelyabinsk Oblast Sanitary-Epidemiological Station. "A nuclear power plant will in no way solve the problem of the reservoirs, but only postpone it for a while."

The point is that nuclear power engineering units, just as any other equipment, do not last forever. In two or three decades, after the resource has been depleted, it will still have to be shut down for dismantling. What will happen then? Will not the radiation contamination of the environment even be heightened due to the parts of the spent reactor? These problems have not appeared because of the South Urals AES. There is absolutely no experience in our country of a practical solution to them. On the other hand, there are already shut-down units, for example, at the Beloyarskaya Nuclear Power Plant, and that is near Sverdlovsk. There is so far not a single disassembled unit.

We talk to O.M. Sarayev, director of the Beloyarskaya AES. Two hundred meters from us is the wall of the main wing of the first section of the plant, with two power units. At the first of them is the uranium-graphite reactor, shut down as far back as 1961, and the second one will operate at the most until March—fuel from it is no longer being stored. What will then be done with the parts from these units, which in two decades of operation have been thoroughly permeated with radiation? The world has long been troubled by these problems. Under the aegis of the IAEA, appropriate recommendations have been worked out and, in France, for example, they have already succeeded in disassembling industrial graphite units. Our country has been lagging behind. For a long time, nuclear scientists had a simplified approach: It was simpler to pour concrete over the dead units than to deactivate the parts. Let gigantic sarcophagi grow on our land.

Now, since Chernobyl, they have been thinking seriously, but how much time has been lost! A program for disassembling the units has finally been drawn up, methods of gathering and packaging the wastes have been studied by the laboratory route, and there is a furnace with a deactivation unit to remelt the contaminated metal. Even before the start of the dismantling, however, the matter is not moving quickly. There must be industrial technology, and it has not been developed. A great deal of money is required: In the opinion of some scientists, taking a nuclear power plant out of operation will cost from 20 (highly improbable) to 100 percent (more realistic) of the expenditures to build it. In all, several units in the country will have to be dismantled in a short time.

We also found mention of the fact that there are no studies on conservation and dismantling the spent units of a nuclear power plant in the conclusion of the expert commission of USSR Goskompriroda on a planned solution for the South Urals AES. Indeed, the ecological expert examination, under public pressure, was still being carried out this summer, over five years after the start of the construction project. Moreover, the experts were essentially faced with the fact that R250 million had already been invested in the planning and construction of the South Urals Nuclear plant. The commission made serious comments. It is said, specifically, that the plan presented no materials on processing and burying the radioactive wastes. After all, it is precisely this question that causes particular alarm for the public: Reactors using fast neutrons, which are to be installed in the new AES, are designed to use what has been spent at other plants and in industrial nuclear fuel reactors.

"Those who ask these questions so loudly apparently do not wish to take into consideration the actual situation with respect to providing the oblast with electric power," says V.I. Amikin, chief engineer of the AES under construction.

In reality, though, can the appearance of a major new source of electric power overcome the shortage? There are different opinions. For example, V.S. Vasilyev, a professor at Chelyabinsk State University, proves convincingly that construction of the AES will inevitably stimulate the next loop of extensive development of the South Urals. Chelyabinsk citizens remember how all-powerful departments foisted on the oblast the next steel-smelting shop at the Chelyabinsk Metallurgical Combine and are planning the same thing for Zlatoust, are building new capacities at the Chelyabinsk Electrolyte Zinc Plant and an oxygen conversion shop at Magnitka. All of this, you will notice, is very energy-intensive production, and if it is to continue in this way, no nuclear power plants will be enough, the industrial centers will really breathe their last! Energy-conserving technology and sensible use of the existing plants should become the alternative to this.

More and more people are beginning to realize that the construction of an AES is a blind path of development. In 20-30 years, scientists and specialists will probably create a technology for taking reactors out of operation. After all, though, the radioactive lakes will remain! All right, are we to wander in the nuclear labyrinth once more? After all, if we adopt the logic of nuclear scientists, that is, to get rid of the danger of overfilling radioactive lakes, generation after generation will be forced to build increasingly new nuclear reactors.

Let us turn once again to the experience of the Beloyarskaya Nuclear Power Plant, included, according to the classification of power engineers, among the normally functioning ones. The Biophysical Station of the Institute of Plant and Animal Ecology of the Ural Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences has the most complete data on how this AES affects everything living around it. This biological station's contribution to the development of continental radioecology is well known. N.V. Kulikov, doctor of biological sciences, directs it. Studies show that radionuclides are being increasingly accumulated from the "safe" nuclear power plant. The Beloyarskaya AES, in two decades, has succeeded in creating precisely the same dead reservoir that threatens catastrophe in the South Urals. It is a question of the Olkhovka swamp, where pre-purified waters are discharged in strict accordance with technology. This naturaly settling pond is already so supersaturated with radioactivity that it had to be proclaimed a confiscated territory. A radionuclide outlet to the Sarapulka and Pyshma rivers was settled on, that is in this same Ob basin. The Olkhovka swamp, however, is at least officially regarded as a settling pond. Nothing polluted is discharged into the Beloyarskiy reservoir, but radionuclides penetrate even here. According to the data of I.V. Molchakova, head of the Radioecological Laboratory, their concentration in the bottom deposits during the years that the AES has existed has increased 10-fold. This means that in a little while these deposits will represent the same radioactive wastes that in the South Urals are to be processed at the chemical combine. Here is your "pure" reservoir.

The construction of the South Urals AES has stopped. This is in no way for ecological considerations, however. It is simply that the USSR Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry is having money problems.

The position of certain medical men is surprising. In convincing the population of the harmless nature of the nuclear power plant, V.L. Shvedov, head of the Chelyabinsk Branch of the Institute of Biophysics of the USSR Ministry of Health, cites data according to which the number of cases of death due to cancer among the inhabitants of Kaslinskiy Rayon who were victims of the Ural accident is lower than in Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, over the territory of which no radioactive cloud has passed. The indifference is undisguised: After all, V.L. Shvedov knows very well that it was in Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon precisely that a considerable number of the population of the contaminated locality turned up and it is through this precise rayon that the Techa river flows, which the Mayak Chemical Combine has ruined. Incidentally, when we discovered that the budget of the Institute of Biophysics, just as that of other cost accounting scientific research institutes of the Third Main Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health, which serves the nuclear scientists, depends directly on the purchaser—the Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry, everything fell into place.

It is not for newspaper reporters to suggest some sort of technical solutions. One of the specialists feels that the thermal power plant is coping with the task of evaporating the radioactive lakes and maintaining them at a safe level. Honestly, the Ural citizens, who have lived through a nuclear accident and who know about the major fire on the night of January 1 1979 at the Beloyarskaya AES, which was almost finished by the explosion, have a right to present the most rigorous claims to the nuclear scientists.

Space Research Must Be 'Kept on Course'

PM2211112289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Special correspondent A. Pokrovskiy report on International Aeronautical Federation congress in Malaga: "Where Are We Flying To? Space Science and Practical Cosmonautics"]

[Text] Malaga, Moscow—Polite applause marked the end of "Soviet day" at the Malaga congress, and at the same time the end of the congress itself, the 40th in the lifetime of the International Aeronautical Federation. Round numbers prompt summings-up, and the slogan chosen for the congress was "The Next 40 Years in Space."

But the experts who gathered in Spain proved reluctant to make predictions. The Soviet delegation, on "its" day, confined itself entirely to reports on faits accomplis—"Energiya" and "Buran." I remember how at the same congress in Brighton 2 years ago, the first reports on them prompted a torrent of questions in the packed auditorium. This time, the spent energy of technical details created no more than a measured hum in the spacious premises. The thought processes apparently did not generate enough heat to illuminate even the immediate future in the highways of space, not even the future work of "Buran" itself. Indeed, perhaps it is no accident that "Buran" has been resting for a year after its single flight, or perhaps waiting to be given tasks appropriate to its fabulous powers.

What, in fact, is happening to our cosmonautics? Has it been knocked off course by the wave of criticism, which is particularly keenly felt after the accustomed eulogies? Or are PRAVDA's readers, whose letters were received on the eve of the congress, justified in their concern: "The view that we need to reduce spending on space is fairly widespread. It is fundamentally wrong! It is not sensible, not statesmanlike! You cannot ruin what is probably one of the few areas of science and technology today to have achieved world standards and even to be in the lead in many respects" (V. Nekhayev from Mogilev).

The question is formulated even more sharply by V. Beregoy from Moldavia: "Cosmonautics is probably the only sector that we can still be proud of today. For the time being.... But tomorrow? Tomorrow, perhaps, we will be lagging behind entirely. As long as the history of 'catching up' does not repeat itself.... I am willing to sacrifice my own resources, only do not ruin cosmonautics."

It appears that passions over resources have subsided somewhat recently. It has become clear that cosmonautics does not take so very much from society as appeared from the outside, but that it gives society more and more every year. All the same, let us suppose for a moment that it was given uncounted billions. What program beneficial to the prosperity of human civilization could the ideologists of modern cosmonautics offer for that money? I am afraid the question is purely rhetorical.

This is why. PRAVDA has written before about the uninspired nature of the outlines of our space program through the year 2005. I understand how this could wound the self-esteem of highly respected scientists. They did take offense. But the esteemed scientific institutions, among them the Institute of Space Research, which was directly mentioned in the column "It's Science Fiction," were unable to shrug off the injury by reporting promising developments.

Yet Academician R. Sagdeyev, ex-director of the Institute of Space Research, stated publicly: "When I ran for people's deputy from the Academy of Sciences, I included the following item on my election program: 'To restore the Soviet people's trust in the space program.' And I believe this must be done through glasnost, through truthful information, without empty show."

I found the key to this strange situation after my return from the congress, in an interview with another academician—V. Mishin. The chief designer, also now "ex," states: "First of all it is necessary to know and to have a long-term scientific program for space research. Unfortunately, what we have is a handful of disparate instructions pursuing political or prestige goals."

No, it was clearly no accident that as we returned to our hotel from the Malaga Palace of Congresses on that not very triumphant "Soviet" day, several members of the delegation and I recalled the times when there used to be two code names—Chief Designer and Chief Theorist. Now we know their real names. I think our respect for the services to world science and technology of that brilliant engineer and organizer Sergey Pavlovich Korolev will only increase when we consider that alongside him for many years was that profound theorist, Mstislav Vsevolodovich Keldysh.

At the same time I cannot help feeling that in "space circles" that name is increasingly receding into the shadows. The idea of the "autonomy" of space technology is simultaneously becoming more and more firmly established.

In crude terms, you could put it like this: Diverse and, frankly, talented collectives of "fixers," operating on the basis of their own tasks and ideas about priorities, create the latest "products," as they call them. Then they go to the scientists: Think about it, see what you can do with them.

Is not that what happened with "Buran"? They performed miracles of technical invention, organization, and targeted planning, but then they discovered that at the moment there is nothing weighing tens of tons to be shipped from space, and that anyway the scientists would have preferred to make do with cheaper, special-purpose automated devices. In short, the desire to "catch up" with the American "Shuttles" which our reader Beregoy was afraid of, played a cruel joke here.

In fact, Academician R. Sagdeyev attributes to the same factors the failure of the "Fobos" project, which cost our country R272 million, while foreign participants spent another 60 million on it. He says frankly that the reason for the failure should be sought in the actual organization of the project and its planning, and that under the burden of routine concerns we have lost control of the planning of cosmonautics. He goes on to admit: "Basically the USSR Academy of Sciences, and specifically our institute (and a number of others), is a client commissioning devices for carrying out fundamental research in space. The contractor, the producer of the work is the space industry in the shape of the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building. I am forced to observe that the relations that have grown up between the client and the contractor over many years of work are patently abnormal: We cannot yet regard ourselves as a fully functioning client, since we are totally dependent on the producer."

So a vicious circle is formed. The result of the fact that science and industry are losing their common language. The language that S.P. Korolev and M.V. Keldysh managed to find, despite the complexity of their relationship and characters.

Of course, cosmonautics has changed markedly since then. It has developed a great many ramifications. There are manned and automatic devices, devices for applied and fundamental research, for the study of near (near-earth) and distant space, and so forth. So what are we doing, rushing around in all directions on a trial and error basis?

It looks as if that is what we are trying to do—everything in small doses.

Yet it is well known how rewardingly space resources respond to an intelligently and purposefully formulated program. We have, for instance, a space communications system that has been operating efficiently for a long time, giving the country, and all of us, tangible technical and economic benefits. At the Malaga congress there was talk of how, in future, seats of human civilization could arise around the Earth, the Moon, and Mars, linked by interplanetary routes. Are we using the experience already accumulated to develop such projects?

...When each manned spacecraft goes into orbit, the crew always reports: "Pitch and yaw normal!" That means that the device's angles of deviation in various planes are in no danger of exceeding the set parameters. But is the pitch and yaw of space science normal? Furthermore, are we sending it into the right orbit, do we have the right strategic line to enable us to bring together our scattered avenues of space research and select the most important for the sake of general efficiency?

Let us study this on the basis of an example. In Malaga, L. Regel, scientific staffer at the Institute of Space Research, explained to me her conclusions on the organization of research in the sphere of space materials science. Combining this research with, say, astronomical observations has not been beneficial. While, for instance, a telescope requires the constant orientation of the spacecraft toward a given point, the processes taking place in weightlessness, on the other hand, react sensitively to the slightest acceleration of the spacecraft, which affects the level of microgravitation. Hence it came about that from mid-1987 through the end of 1989 only one-half of the trials on the "Kristallizator" equipment were completed.

So it goes on. Some firms manufacturing space devices are now claiming complete autonomy in drawing up experimental programs, on the basis of an exclusively commercial approach to their implementation. This means that in this particular instance, too, we are trying to punch with our fingers spread, instead of gathering them all into a single fist of fundamental research.

L. Regel draws the natural conclusion—it is expedient to create a single center for fundamental research in materials science and technology in different gravitational conditions, involving all interested institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the country's industry, as well as foreign organizations. But if this is expedient for one highly promising sector of cosmonautics, it is all the more necessary for space science in general.

Alas, at the moment the movement is in the opposite direction. The Institute of Space Research has clearly not turned into a collective Chief Theorist, and by all appearances there is not much hope of it. The institute's staff, which has grown to an unmanageable size, is not integrating the living soul of cosmonautics, but dividing it up into separate sections commensurate with the interests of departments and laboratories. The functions of "Interkosmos," which until recently pursued fairly confidently the international cooperation among space specialists, have been distorted with the appearance of the USSR Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology, which pursues its own commercial line. Individual firms are increasingly laying claim to autonomous roles.

Initiative is no bad thing. But its "pitch and yaw" must also be kept on the right course. This can only be done by a single organization, a single scientific council defining the main areas of development of cosmonautics, and thence technical priorities. Such a council should include not only specialists in narrow fields, but also, without fail, philosophers, sociologists, and social scientists. It is a question of the future of mankind, the destiny of our civilization. There can be no such thing as technology that is indifferent to man and his concerns. Whatever distant reaches of space the most sophisticated space devices may travel, their guiding star should always be the flame of life that blazed up on the planet Earth.

High Funding for Arctic Research Questioned

PM2011113389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Master Mariner Ya. Stupan: "The Frozen Region. Are the Millions Being Spent on Research in the Arctic Bearing Fruit?"]

[Text] Riga—Economists are doing their utmost to overcome the budget deficit and find the money to improve the lot of pensioners, not to mention other social needs. But in the endless expanses of the Arctic the winds of the north of are still scattering like dry leaves the people's resources which have been invested in the region and which have not borne and are not expected at the moment to bear fruit.

It is 20 years since I first chanced upon this inclement region as a mariner. Raised on the exploits of people like Papanin, Chelyuskin, and other pioneers of the North, I was very puzzled even then by the general air of mismanagement and the indifference and irresponsibility on the part of "responsible" people, due mainly to the time-serving mentality: apres nous le deluge [after us comes the flood]. The years went by, Arctic voyages took place, there were triumphant accounts of labor exploits and of the conquest of the elements. But now, 20 years on, it has to be recorded that there have been no particular changes for the better.

The Arctic, for many years outside the zone of glasnost and criticism, has enabled its "conquerors" to be so secretive that, seemingly, not only ordinary citizens but even members of our parliament have no notion of the billions that lie frozen there. Indeed the media have reported nothing except the "year-round" voyages and expeditions to the high latitudes.... But the methods and approaches to the development of the region remain unchanged and, inevitably, are hopelessly out of date, and cannot be of benefit to the national economy.

There are numerous polar stations, posts, and winter quarters scattered about the coasts and islands of the Arctic seas, just as there were 20 or 50 years ago. During the winter the most the personnel can do is transmit to the mainland meteorological data, obtained by antediluvian methods or simply made up. This is confirmed by the unreliability of the weather forecasts that are issued. For example, in the vicinity of the Yugorskiy Shar strait there are three polar stations very close to one another and right next to the settlement of Amderma, acknowledged center of the Western Arctic: They are at the western and eastern entrances to the straight, on Tonkiy Cape, and a little to the east. What the station personnel are working on and what they have done for science is a matter for conjecture. They cannot even claim to be gathering meteorological data: Next door, in Amderma, there is a water research center, which has much greater potential in that sphere. People say that workers at the stations get early retirement, supplementary pay, and other northern privileges. Is this kind of extravagance justified, paying people simply for living in extreme conditions; and who stands to gain, apart from the Arctic workers themselves?

Indeed, you cannot understand why, in our space age, when the sky is full of meteorological satellites, when ice reconnaissance aircraft and helicopters are flying back and forth beneath the clouds, and submarimes are surfacing at the pole, we are still clinging to the primitive methods of Arctic study. In the thirties they were the only possible way, but today there is no lack of automatic means of collecting and transmitting information.

They say that from a satellite it is possible not only to measure and transmit the parameters of the meteorological situation, but to even see servicemen's insignia. The era of conversion would be the right time to use the military department's potential for peaceful purposes in this inaccessible region. Just recently the United States used one of its space shuttles to place a spy satellite in orbit to observe practically the entire territory of the USSR. So are we incapable of looking at our own Arctic Ocean from space? I think not. The inhibiting factors are the established stereotypes, antiquated military doctrines, and a reluctance to surrender the privilege to spend the people's money at will.

Everything is still being done in the old way. The Arctic shipping season begins and dozens of freighters hasten to the Arctic with holds full of fuel, supplies, and food. Hundreds of tonnes of essential diesel fuel and gasoline are brought in. This at a time when combines are grinding to a halt in the fields and flights are being cancelled because of a shortage of fuel.... The flow of freight to the Arctic remains one-way and is tending to increase. Unproductive idling time, which can account for as much as 40 percent of a ship's time budget in the Arctic, makes an enormous dent in the national economy. Strangely enough, this is more often than not due not to insuperable natural conditions, but to poor organization, useless freight handling, nonexistent communications, and a reluctance or disinclination on the part of local freight-owners to accelerate the transport process. Accumulated reserves would enable the winterers to live comfortably for some years and wait for replacements, without bothering about unloading ships.

More and more nuclear icebreakers and ships with an enhanced ice capability are being commissioned, costing tens and tens of millions of rubles and requiring a thorough overhaul after each trip. Who can say how much it costs the country to maintain this unique Arctic fleet? Is it not time we worked out what each tonne of freight delivered to the Far North costs the state, that is, you and me, and how the winterers of, for example, Victoria Island or the Franz Josef Land archipelagoes are using all the money that has been spent? When are we going to see something for it? Indeed, the transport operation to deliver a very limited amount of freight to, for example, Rudolf Island or Graham Bell Island involves icebreakers and ships costing tens of thousands of rubles a day, and the trip takes weeks. Do not misunderstand me: No one questions the need to study the Arctic, but what is needed is more rational and better methods and approaches. If we are giving priority to the economy today, it would be interesting to know what each tonne of low-calory coal mined in our concession on Spitsbergen is costing us all, what proportion of the country's fuel stocks it represents, and whether the very existence of Barentsburg and Pyramiden on this Norwegian archipelago is justified at all?

Certain military concepts are outdated in conditions of detente and new thinking. In my view, the Arctic is the most suitable place for carrying out the announced reduction of Armed Forces, since a one-soldier reduction here has at least a double advantage compared with temperate climatic zones. But the biggest gain would be a demilitarized Arctic, free from nuclear weapons.

We must not forget either about the ecological problems, about the environment in this vulnerable region. Unloading hundreds of thousands of tonnes of petroleum products using old-fashioned equipment and methods that are ecologically unsound inevitably leads to the pollution of Arctic waters. The Arctic is certainly not going to get any cleaner with hundreds of large ships and a whole fleet of icebreakers there during the summer. Warships have no obligation at all to observe the demand of international conventions on environmental protection and, apparently, that is why the Gulf of Kola is often covered with an iridescent film of oil. Still to come is the drilling of wells on the shelf of the Arctic seas and big tankers laden with crude. The question is: Are we capable of solving these questions in technologically the right way and without detriment to the environment? Do we have the requisite technical facilities to be able to extract the resources hidden deep in the Arctic and need we do it? Let us consider what the Americans, who possess higher technology and whose funds are less limited, would do in our place. The United States has stopped taking oil and gas out of Alaska by sea and has laid a pipeline across Canada, across the entire continent, despite the cost. Another thing comes to mind: The Americans, who possess large stocks of crude, are in no hurry to exploit them as soon as possible. What would be left for our children and grandchildren? Perhaps the Arctic, transformed into an ecologically clean, demilitarized zone, could be our gift to future generations. Our descendants would have much greater opportunities to use the northern region's natural resources to maximum benefit without problems and without harming our country or the planet as a whole.

I think it is time the USSR Supreme Soviet put a stop to the tyrannical departmental behavior in this area. No economic, scientific, or military end can justify jeopardizing the future, which is what thoughtless and shortsighted management in the Arctic is essentially doing at the moment.

One would hope that the era of dubious heroism and economic adventures is gone forever and that the time has come for valid scientific concepts and a businesslike approach to the Arctic. One would like to believe that we will pass on to our descendants an unblemished Arctic, clothed in white, that we will not sully its clear waters, and not play havoc with its mineral resources, as did the treasure-hunters.

There is time yet to halt the processes of Arctic pollution, but tomorrow will be too late.